Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Post-Graduate and Research Department Series, No. 32

MAHĀBHĀṢYADĪPIKĀ

OF

BHARTṚHARI

Fascicule VI : Āhnika IV

critically edited by

G. V. Devasthali

G. B. Palsule

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
POONA, INDIA
1989

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
POONA, INDIA

MAHĀBHĀṢYADĪPIKĀ
Fascicule VI : Ahnika IV

The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute is indebted to the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Orientabteilung, Berlin, for their kind permission to use a photo-copy of their manuscript (Chambers 553) of the *Mahābhāṣyadīpikā* for this Critical Edition which is based on it.

Printed at the Bhandarkar Institute Press
and
Published by R. N. Dandekar, Secretary,
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
Poona 411 004 (India)

भर्तृहरिविरचितायां

महाभाष्यदीपिकायां चतुर्थमाह्निकम्

महाभाष्यदीपिकायां चतुर्थमाह्निकम्

न धातुलोप आर्धधातुके ॥ १.१.४ ॥

[१] अक्तपरिमाणस्य शब्दस्य धातुसंज्ञा। तस्य च लोपे नैवास्ति प्रसङ्गो गुणवृद्ध्योः, किं प्रतिषेधेनेति। अतो वृत्तिकारो व्याचष्टे — 'धातोर्लोपो धातुलोपः। धात्वेकदेशलोपनिमित्त आर्धधातुके' इति।

अपर एवमाह। धातोश्चैकदेशस्य च लोपो धातुलोपः। धातुलोपनिमित्त इति। योऽपि कृत्स्नस्य धातोर्लोपोऽसावपि धातुलोपः, योऽप्येकदेशस्य लोपोऽसावपि धातुलोप इति शब्दवृत्तं कथयति। इह त्वेकदेशलोपः संभवति इत्ययं परिगृह्यते।

अनेन प्रकारेणैतदाख्यायते। अवयवानां या तु सति कात्स्न्र्ये धातुसंज्ञा तया व्यवह्रियते। न तु कृत्स्नविषयया, समुदायलोपे प्रतिषेध्ययोरभावात् इति धातुग्रहणस्य दर्शनम्।

धातुशब्दो धातावेव समुदाये, लोपोऽप्येकदेशाभाव एव। यस्त्वसावेकदेशाभावः, समुदायस्य संबन्धित्वेन स दिश्यते, अवयवकर्मणः समुदाये व्यपदेशात्। पटो दग्धः, अलंकृतो देवदत्तः, कि(? क्लि)न्नो देवदत्त इति यथा।

अयमेव चार्थो वृत्तिकारैः प्रदर्शितः। धात्वेकदेशलोपो धातुलोप इति।

[२] धातुग्रहणं किमर्थम्? ननु गुणभावात् प्रश्नानुपपत्तिः। एवं च केचिद् वृत्तिकारा 'धातुलोप इति किमर्थम्?' इति पठन्ति। समुदायमभिदधतामपि तेषामवयव एव चोद्यते। अन्यथा बालवाक्यं स्यात्, यत्रैव विधिस्तत्रैव प्रतिषेधश्चेति। नैष दोषः। सामर्थ्यात् प्राप्तिश्चा(? प्राप्तं चा)पेक्ष्यं निर्दिशति।

लूञ् लविता। ननु चात्र वृत्तौ प्रत्युदाहरणं नोपपद्यते, धातुलोपनिमित्त आर्धधातुके प्रति[षेध]वचनात्। अयमभिप्रायः। सति धातुग्रहणे बहुव्रीहिः संभवति। बहुव्रीहौ सत्युभयविशेषणं भवति।

[२.१] कथं पुनरनुबन्धलोपो भवति, न धातुलोपः? उच्यते। इह धातुसंज्ञा इत्संज्ञा च यौगपद्येन प्रवर्तेते। यश्चेत्संज्ञः स नास्तीति शास्त्रेऽभ्युपगमः। एवं

च सति यस्यामेवावस्थायां धातुसंज्ञा तस्यामेव चेत्संज्ञा। यदा च धातुसंज्ञा संनिपतिता तदा नैवास्त्यनुबन्ध इति असतो नास्ति धातुसंज्ञा। अथ पूर्वं धातुसंज्ञा एवमपि भावार्थानां धातुसंज्ञा। अर्थश्च प्रयोगशब्दस्यापोध्दृत्यान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामेकदेशस्य परिकल्प्यते। न चानुबन्धस्यान्वयो व्यतिरेको वेति। यावत एवावधेरन्वयव्यतिरेकौ तावत(ति) एव क्रियावचनत्वं परिकल्प्य धातुसंज्ञा प्रवर्तते इति नैष दोषः। ससकारस्यापि दृष्टा क्रियावचनता तिष्ठासतीत्येवमादिषु।

[२.२] **वृषभो रोरवीति**। सत्यार्धधातुकग्रहणे शब्द[व]त्त्वादन्यपदार्थस्यासंदिग्धो बहुव्रीहिर्विज्ञायते इति आर्धधातुकग्रहणम्। भाष्यकारोऽप्येतदर्थं चैतानि प्रत्युदाहरणानि उपन्यस्यति, क्रमेण सूत्रप्रत्याख्यानं करिष्यामि, पक्षे च धातुग्रहणमनर्थकमिति वक्ष्यामीति।

[२.३] चत्वारः पक्षाः संभवन्तोऽत्रो(? °वन्ति; द्वावत्रो)पन्यस्तौ — (१) लोपविशेषणमार्धधातुकग्रहणम्, (२) गुणवृद्धिविशेषणम्, (३) अन्तरेण बहुव्रीहिमुभयविशेषणम् आवृत्तेः, यथोपदेशग्रहणम् 'एकाच उपदेशेऽनुदात्तात्' (पा. ७. २. १०) इति, (४) बहुव्रीहिरिति।

[३] **किं पुनरिदमार्धधातुकग्रहणमिति**। किमार्धधातुकाधारो लोपो गुणवृद्ध्यभावस्योपलक्षणत्वेनोपादीयते, अथ आर्धधातुकाधारयोः गुणवृद्ध्योरतन्निमित्तोऽपि लोप उपलक्षणत्वेनोपादीयत इति। किं पुनरत्र न्याय्यम्? उभयमित्याह। कथम्? लोपगुणयोः प्रतिषेधाङ्गभावात्। प्रतिषेधे द्वावप्येतौ गुणीभूतौ — लोपो गुणश्च, तत्रार्धधातुकमुभयोः संबन्धि संभवतीति पृच्छति।

उपेद्धः, प्रेद्ध इ[त्य]त्रापि प्राप्नोति। नन्वन्तरङ्गत्वात् पूर्वमेवाद्गुणः प्राप्नोति। 'पूर्वं धातुरुपसर्गेण युज्यते' इति। तस्मादिदमुदाहरणं कष्टेद्ध इति। यदि च [उ]पसर्गत्वं त्वन्यत्कव्येमुपगतरे (?)... [°सर्गात् पूर्वं प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः, कथमुपे]द्धः, प्रेद्धः? नैष दोषः। वक्ष्यत्येवायमन्तरङ्गबहिरङ्गभावम्। यदि पूर्वमुपसर्गयोगोऽभ्युपगम्यते, गुणोऽन्तरङ्गो बहिरङ्गः प्रतिषेधः। अथ पूर्वं प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः, एवमपि गुणो बहिरङ्गोऽन्तरङ्गः प्रतिषेध इति। अयं तु नोक्तः परिहारः अनिग्लक्षणत्वात् इत्युत्तरत्र वक्ष्यामीति।

ननु च 'नाजानन्तर्ये बहिष्ट्वप्रक्लृप्तिः' इति न साध्वसाधुपरिज्ञानं चेद्भवति इति। एतत्तु नोपपद्यते। शास्त्रात् साध्वसाधुप्रवृत्तेः। अन्ये वर्णनिष्पत्तिरित्याहुः।

हिरण्यवूरिति यणो निर्वृत्तिः। एवं तु सति प्रतिषेधोऽपि निष्पाद्यत इत्ययमर्थः। तस्मादयमर्थः, अचामानन्तर्यस्य विधिरूपेण यस्मिन् शास्त्रे आश्रयणमस्ति तत्राप्रवृत्तिः। इह तु प्रतिषेधे न तयोराश्रयणमित्यदोषः।

क्नोपयतीत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति। ननु चात्र पुको बहिरङ्गत्वात् यलोपो न प्राप्नोति। अथ निपातनाल्लोपः 'चेले क्नोपेः' (पा. ३. ४. ३३) इति, निपातनात् गुणो भविष्यति।

यद्येवं नार्थो धातुग्रहणेन। अन्तरेण बहुव्रीहिमुभयविशेषणमार्धधातुकग्रहणं संभवत्येव। लोपे आर्धधातुके ये गुणवृद्धी प्राप्नुतः ते न भवत इति। न चानुबन्धलोप आर्धधातुकनिमित्तः।

[४] परिगणनं कर्तव्यम्। 'न यङ्श्नक्क्यवलोपे आर्धधातुके' इत्ययं योगः पठितव्यः। एवं पठ्यमाने क्नोपयत्यादयः सिद्धा भवन्ति। वलोप इत्यत्र कश्चित् विशेष आश्रयितव्यः। येन जीवेः प्रत्ययो न स्त्रिवेः।

[४.१] नुम्लोपस्त्रिव्यनुबन्धलोपेऽप्रतिषेधार्थम्। नुमित्यनुषङ्गस्य ग्रहणम्। पूर्वाचार्यसंज्ञा [ज्ञात]व्या। अन्यथा नुमः स्थानापन्ने [लोपे] इति इष्टग्रहणं न गृह्येत। अत्र परिगणनादेतेषु नास्ति प्रतिषेधः। असति हि परिगणने धातुलोप इति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति।

[४.२] इक्प्रकरणात् नुम्लोपे वृद्धिः। यत्र नुमि [इक इति] एतदुपतिष्ठते स्थान्यन्तरनिवृत्त्यर्थं तत्रायं प्रतिषेधः। अत्र इक इत्यस्याव्यापारः।

[४.३] प्रत्ययाश्रयत्वादन्यत्र सिद्धम्। उभयविशेषणमार्धधातुकमित्यभिप्रायः।

जीरदानुरित्यत्र न प्राप्नोति। न ह्ययं प्रत्ययाश्रयो लोपः। किं तर्हि? वर्णाश्रयः। वलोप इति वचनात्।

[४.४] रकि ज्यः प्रसारणम्। तत्र विङ्कतीति सिद्धः प्रतिषेधः। अवग्रहश्च सिद्धः। स्वरोऽपि बहुव्रीहित्वात् न दुष्यति।

बृहिः प्रकृत्यन्तरम्। आतश्च प्रकृत्यन्तरमविगानेन विशिष्य यदुपदिशन्ति खिलपाठे। न ह्ययमाहिरिव पञ्चपदविषय इति।

भेद्यते, छेद्यते इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति। द्वयमप्येतदार्धधातुके, णिलोपस्यार्धधातुकनिमित्तत्वात्, णौ चार्धधातुके गुणवृद्ध्योः प्राप्तिरिति। इदं तु नोपपद्यते। प्रागेव सार्वधातुकविकरणाभ्यां णावेव गुणस्य कृतत्वात्।

नैवं विज्ञायते इति। बहुव्रीहिरयमित्येतत् कथयति। बहुव्रीहौ सत्येकनिमित्तत्वाभ्युपगमो लोपस्य गुणवृद्ध्योश्च। इह भेद्यते इत्य[न्य]स्मिन् आर्धधातुके लोपो अन्यस्मिन् गुणवृद्धी इति नास्ति प्रतिषेधः।

[५] यत्र हलचोरादेशः। 'यङोऽचि च' (पा. २. ४. ७४) इति समुदायः प्रत्ययसंज्ञः। तस्य च लुका अदर्शनं संभवति इति।

अत्राप्यकारलोपे कृते। अयमभिप्रायः। यकारमात्रं प्रत्ययसंज्ञमेवाकारलोपे। यथा अपचदिति एकान्तापगमेऽपि अवशिष्टे भवत्येव प्रत्ययसंज्ञा। न च 'यङोऽचि च' (पा. २. ४. ७४) इति सहकारेण समुदायो विवक्ष्यते। यथा गौरिति आकृत्युपदेशे वर्णादयो न विवक्ष्यन्त इति तद्गुणश्चातद्गुणश्च भवत्येव गौरेवमिहापि सति [असति] चाकारे भवत्येव यङिति।

लुकि कृते न प्राप्नोति। वक्ष्यमाणोऽभिप्रायो नित्यो लुगिति।

इदमिह संप्रधार्यम्। अवशिष्टस्य लुगित्यभिप्रायः। लोपस्यावकाशः – चिकीर्षिता। लुकोऽवकाशो – यकारमात्रम्। समुदाय उभयं प्राप्नोति। परत्वात् यङो[ऽकारस्य] लोपः इति।

नित्यो लुक्। शास्त्रप्रवृत्तिर्नित्येति लुको नित्यत्वम्। लुका तु सर्वस्मिन् निवर्तिते असंभवो लोपस्येत्यनित्यत्वम्।

लुगप्यनित्यः। शब्दे भेदं परिगृह्यानित्यत्वं लुक आचष्टे। समुदाये ह्याश्रिते यद्यतो लोपः प्रवर्तते अनच्कस्य लुक्। अथाकृते साकारस्य, इति लुकोऽप्यनित्यत्वम्। अत्र द्वयोरनित्ययोः परत्वात् अतो लोपः।

अनवकाशस्तर्हि लुक्। कथमनवकाशत्वं मन्यते? नाप्राप्ते लोपे लुक आरम्भात्। यदि हि लुक् नोच्येत, अतो लोपः स्यात्। अथ वा प्रत्ययस्य लुगुच्यते। न च यकारमात्रं प्रत्ययः। कुतः? प्रयोगे अभावात्। उपदेशे च यकारमात्रस्यानुपदेशात्। अतो नैवास्य प्रयोगात् प्रत्ययत्वाध्यवसायो, नोपदेशात्। किं च 'यङोऽचि च' (पा. २. ४. ७४) इति समुदायो निर्दिष्टः। तस्मादनवकाशो लुगिति।

सावकाशो लुक्। कोऽवकाशः? अवशिष्टः। एवं मन्यते। भिन्नविषयौ लोपलुकौ। अस्ति च यकारमात्रस्य प्रत्ययत्वसमधिगमो लोलूयितादिषु य एव च सोऽयमित्येकत्वाध्यवसायात्। न च 'यङोऽचि च' इति निर्देशरूपं विवक्षितम्। तस्मादवशिष्टमवकाश इति।

अथापि कथंचित् इति। पूर्वोक्तया कल्पनया उच्यते।

एवमप्यल्लोपे योगविभागः करिष्यते। योगविभागश्च लुको बाधनार्थ एवेति।

समानाश्रयो लुक् लोपेन बाध्यते। तुल्यकालत्वात्। 'बहुलं छन्दसि' (पा. २. ४. ७३) इति स निमित्तमनपेक्ष्यान्तरङ्गत्वात् प्रवर्तत एव। ननु चातो लोपोऽप्यार्धधातुकसामान्ये विधीयते। आर्धधातुकोऽत्राश्रीयते। अङ्गाधिकारश्च। अथ वा, यद्यपि सामान्येन तथापि बुद्धिसामान्यमाश्रीयते। लुकि तु बुद्ध्यापि नाश्रयणमिति।

[६] निकुचितेऽप्युक्तम्। [किम्?] संनिपातलक्षणो विधिरिति। कित्त्वसंनियोगेन च लोपः प्रकृतः, स निमित्तम् 'उदुपधात्' (पा. १. २. २१) इति अस्याकित्त्वस्य न भवति। तेनात्र 'क्ङिति च' (पा. १. १. ५) इति प्रतिषेधो भविष्यति, इति।

[७] यदि स्थानिवद्भावेन योगः प्रत्याख्यायते, जङ्गम इत्युपधालोपः प्राप्नोति। तथा याय इति 'आतो लोपः....' (पा. ६. ४. ६४), देय इति युडागमः 'दीङो युडचि क्ङिति' (पा. ६. ४. ६३) इति। ननु च जङ्गम इति '....अनङि' (पा. ६. ४. ९८) इति निषेधो भविष्यति। कथं पुनरयमङ् यावता यङत्रोपदिश्यते? अथापि यकारापगमे स्याद्, एवमपि अनर्थकोऽयम्। अथेह कथं पुनः प्रतिषेधः अगमदिति? अनुवादित्वादर्थवत्त्वात्।

किं च। स्थानिनि कार्यं दृष्टमादेशेऽतिदिश्यते। न चाकारे कार्याणि दृश्यन्ते। तत्र कथं लुप्ते प्रवर्तेरन्? एवं च सति यायावर इति नैवातो लोपः प्राप्तः। किं स्थानिवत्प्रतिषेधेन?

तत्र पाणिनेरयमभिप्रायः। यथैव लकारे कार्यमदृष्टमादेशे प्राप्नोति इति चोद्यते संभवमात्रेण, [एवम्] इहापि। यथैव चाकारापाये भवति प्रत्ययो यकारमात्रम्, एवमिहापि संभवति सत्यवस्थानेऽकारस्य यकारापाये प्रत्ययत्वम् इति यायावरे स्थानिवत्प्रतिषेध आरभ्यते। वार्त्तिककारस्य तु कथं जङ्गमादयः? अस्यापि

लुगिति। तेन यायायः (? यायः), देदीयः इति [न] भवितव्यम्। लोलुवादिषु त्वभ्युपगंस्यते संभवमात्रेण प्रत्ययत्वम्, तत्कृतश्च स्थानिवद्भावादुवङादेश इति ॥

क्ङिति च ॥ १.१.५ ॥

[१] गुणवृद्धी प्रतिषेधश्च द्वावपीहानुमीयमानौ, प्रतिषेधस्तु विधीयमान[त्वा]त् प्रधानम्। न चास्मात् शब्दरूपादस्ति व्यक्तिः — प्रधानमनर्थ्यनेन विशेषणेन क्ङितीति। अस्ति चेदर्थित्वम्, प्रधानमतिलङ्घ्य न युक्तं गुणवृद्धिविशेषणम्। तेन क्ङितीति सप्तमीनिर्दिष्टेऽनन्तरस्य प्रतिषेधेन भवितव्यम्। स्यादेतद्, उभयानु[ग्र]हं गुणवृद्धिविशेषणम्, यथा 'स्त्रियाम्' (पा. ४. १. ३) इत्येतद् गुणभूतस्य विशेषणं प्रातिपदिकस्य। युक्तं हि तत्रोभयानु[ग्र]हाद्, इह तु तथा नेति युक्तं प्रतिषेधविशेषणम्। ननु च गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे व्यवहितानन्तरेषु प्रवर्तमानो महाविषयः [प्रतिषेधः] कृतो भवतीति। एतच्च न। शुनस्कर्णस्तोमयज्ञवदेतत् स्यात्। यथा प्रधानस्य [म]रणे नार्थि(? ङ्गा)नामिष्टं प्रवर्तयन्ति, एवं विशिष्टवि[ष]यावस्थितयैव प्रकृत्या प्रधानमर्थि स्यात्, इत्यतोऽपि अयुक्तोऽयं पक्षः। ननु च प्रतिषेधविशेषणेऽपि गुणवृद्धिविशेषणमेव। सर्वत्रैव हि क्रिया विधीयमाना — गुणवृद्धी भवतो न भवत इति वा। यद्यप्येवं तथापि सत्तासादृश्यमापन्ना गृह्यते, न निवृत्तिरिति सत्तायां गुणवृद्धी विशेषणं, न निवृत्ताविति। एवमपि प्रतिषेधे नानन्तर्यं संभवति इति तद्विशेषणमयुक्तम्। गुणवृद्धिविशेषणेऽप्येवमेव। न हि क्ङिता गुणवृद्ध्योरानन्तर्यमस्ति। तस्मात् गुणवृद्धिविशिष्ट[ः] प्रतिषेधः स्थानिनः पुनारूपप्रसव इकः संस्कार इति। इका च संभवत्यानन्तर्यमिति इदमुच्यते –

[१.१] **तन्निमित्तग्रहणम्** इति। नायं पाठः। किं तर्हि ? अर्थप्रदर्शनमेतत्। तत्र व्याख्यातृभिः स शब्द उपादेयो यस्मिन्नयमर्थः परिगृह्यते। एवं हि पठितव्यम् – 'क्ङिन्निमित्ते च गुणवृद्धी न भवतः' इति। भाष्यकारो निमित्तग्रहणमपूर्वं कर्तव्यमिति प्रतिपन्नः। अन्ये तु निमित्तग्रहणं व्याख्येयमिति वर्णयन्ति। गुणवृद्धिविशेषणं क्ङिद्ग्रहणम्। गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे चानुपस्थानमेवास्याः परिभाषायाः 'तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य' (पा. १. १. ६६) इति। परिभाषा विध्यङ्गभूतत्वात् यत्र विधीयते तत्रोपतिष्ठते; यथा 'इको गुणवृद्धी' इनि (पा. १. १. ३) यत्र गुणवृद्धी विधीयेते तत्रोपतिष्ठते। यत्र तु सिद्धा वृद्धिरन्यार्थमुपादीयते, 'वृद्धिर्यस्याचामादिस्तद् वृद्धम्'

इति (पा. १. १. ७३), न तत्रोपतिष्ठते 'इकः' इति। यद्युपतिष्ठते शालीयादिषु वृद्धसंज्ञा न स्यात्। ज्ञापकं च 'उदीचामातः स्थाने ....' (पा. ७. ३. ४६) इति स्थानग्रहणम्, षष्ठीनिर्देशे अस्थानेयोगनिमित्तः प्रतिषेधो मा भूदिति (?)। एवमिहापि गुणवृद्धी न विधीयेते। विहितयोरन्यत्र भूतयोः क्ङितीति ह्येतदुपादीयते इत्यनुपस्थानादनन्तरपरिभाषाया व्यवहितेऽनन्तरे च सिद्ध[ः] प्रतिषेधः। क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी विहिते ते न भवतः। क्ङिति प्रतिषेधे नास्ति निमित्तपरिग्रहः। एतत्तु नोपपद्यते। प्रतिषेधस्य प्राधान्यात्। अर्थेऽन्तर्भूतस्यैवायमनुग्रह इति कोऽनुरोधः प्रतिषेधानुग्रहे, न पुनर्गुणवृद्धिशास्त्रानुग्रहे ? 'तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य' इत्येतत्र स्थानं परिभाषाया इति निमित्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। लिङ्गाच्च कस्माच्चित् गुणवृद्धिविशेषणं कल्पयितव्यम्। अनेन प्रधानं धर्मवैचित्र्यात् कदाचिद् गुणेष्वासजति धर्मान् — स चासङ्गः स्वकार्यप्रतिपत्त्यर्थ एव — कदाचिदात्मनैव तान् धर्मान् प्रतिपद्य कार्येषु प्रवर्तते। यश्च दृष्टान्त[स्त]स्मिन् मरणं यजमानस्य साक्षात् श्रुतम्। इह पुनर्नास्तीति अनेकविषयत्वं कल्प्यते साक्षाद्गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे।

[२] उपधार्थं रोरवीत्यर्थम् [च]। उपधाया व्यवहितार्थम्, इतरत्र तु यङ्निमित्तप्रतिषेधो मा भूदिति। यत्रैव क्ङित्यनन्तरो गुणभाव्यस्ति इति। एवमर्थमिदमुच्यते — गुणभावी[क्]प्रतिषेधे आनन्तर्याभावात् (?)। यथेह 'इको यणचि' (पा. ६. १. ७७) इकानन्तर्यमचः संभवति यणा च, एवमिह न प्रतिषेधेन नापि गुणवृद्धिभ्यामिति इकैवानन्तर्यात्। गुणप्रवृत्तिमाचष्टे, वृद्धौ कस्मान्नोदाहृतम् ? इहैव स्यात् मृष्ट इति। अयमभिप्रायः — निर्दिश्यते तत्र स्थानी वृद्धेः '[मृजे]र्वृद्धिरचः' इति।

[२.१] ननु च यस्य गुण उच्यते। कथं पुनरसंशब्दितमप्रकृतं च पुगन्तलघूपधं शक्यमाश्रयितुम् ? यदि च गुणभूतस्य पुगन्तलघूपधस्य क्ङिता विशेषणम्, को मत्सरो गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे इति ? यत् तावदुच्यते — अप्रकृतमसंशब्दितं चेति। अत्र ब्रूमः — नावश्यं शब्दप्रकरणाभ्यामेव संनिधानम्, सामर्थ्यादपि हि भवति संनिधानम्। इह च क्ङिति गुणवृद्धी न भवतः। कस्येत्याकाङ्क्षा। अथ वा क्ङितीति प्रत्ययग्रहणे सति अङ्गमपि संनिहितमिति सामर्थ्यप्रापितसंनिधानं पुगन्तलघूपधम्। यच्चोच्यते गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे को मत्सर इति। गुणवृद्धिविशेषणेऽपि सति व्यवहिते नैव प्राप्नोति। कथम् ? यथैव 'इको यणचि' इति भूतेऽपि यण्यानन्तर्ये व्याप्रियते

'अजनन्तरपरस्य इको यण् भवति' इति अतो यण् प्रवर्तते, ए[व]मिह भूतयोरपि गुणवृद्ध्योः क्ङितीति आनन्तर्यं स्यादेव। तेन यत्र गुणवृद्धिभावी इक् अ[नन्]तरस्तत्र [न] स्यादेव प्रतिषेध इति स एव दोषो यः प्रतिषेधविशेषणे। तस्मात् पुगन्तलघूपधस्यैव भूतस्यानन्तर्यमाश्रयितव्यं यत्रानन्तरपरिभाषा व्याप्रियमाणानुगृह्यत इत्ययमर्थः संपन्नः — क्ङित्यनन्तरे पुगन्तलघूपधस्य गुणो न भवतीति। अङ्गस्येति च नोक्तम्। नाङ्गमात्रं गुणभाक्। किं तर्हि? विशिष्टमङ्गम् — सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः। **पुगन्तलघूपधस्येति नैवं विज्ञायते।** नात्र समुदायः प्रतिनिर्दिश्यते। किं तर्हि? अवयवः। स च व्यवहित इत्यप्राप्तिः प्रतिषेधस्य। लघ्व्या उप[धा]याः क्ङिति न भवतीति।

[२.२] शचङन्ते दोषः। तन्निमित्तग्रहणे सति अतन्निमित्तो गुणः प्राप्नोति, यथा शे रियतीति। ननु च क्रियमाणे तन्निमित्तग्रहणेऽदोष एव। बहिरङ्गो गुणः, अन्तरङ्गः प्रतिषेधः, असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे इति। वक्ष्यति चैतत् परिहारान्तरं रोरवीतीत्यत्र। अत्रेदमेवमुपात्तिनिमित्तं वर्ण्यते — यन्मन्यसे तन्निमित्तपक्षोऽदुष्ट इति, अत्राप्यस्ति दोष इति।

[२.३] हतः, हथः। पूर्वपक्षोऽत्राभिमतः। एवं मन्यते – यथैव 'अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः' (पा. २. ४. ७२) इति, 'आयादय आर्धधातुके वा' (पा. ३. १. ३१) इति वाक्यभेदेन विहिताः सन्तो निवर्त्यन्ते, एवमयमप्यकारो धातुपाठ उपदिष्टः क्ङित्सु निवर्तत इति। **प्रसक्तस्या[न]भिनिर्वृत्तस्येति।** किमर्थं द्वयमुच्यते, न पुनरन्यतरदुच्येत? एवमर्थं वक्तव्यम् — यदि तावत् प्रसक्तस्येत्येतावदुच्यते, प्रसक्तो द्विप्रकारोऽभिनिर्वृत्तोऽनभिनिर्वृत्तश्च। यद्येवम्, अनभिनिर्वृत्तस्येत्येवास्तु। असावपि द्विप्रकारः, प्रसक्तश्चाप्रसक्तश्च। तस्माद्ययवधार्मामयात्र (?) भवितव्यमिति प्रसक्तः। तद्य(? °था)नभिनिर्वृत्तस्यात्मप्रतिषेधः प्रवर्तत इति उभयमुच्यते।

अस्याप्ययमभिप्रायः — इह कश्चिद् गुणः सन्नेव हतो हथ इत्येवमादिषु। कश्चिद् विधेयः कर्तादिषु विना पाठं तृचि इत्येवमादिषु। [इग्] उपदिष्टस्तस्य गुणो विधीयते तृजादिषु। स च पुनर्निवर्त्यते क्ङिति प्रत्यये। तत्रायं प्रतिषेधो विधीयमानस्य भावादेव तमेव निवर्तयति, न भूतम्। इह तु नैवान्यः शप् [अ]स्ति नाप्यायादय इति सन्तोऽपि निवर्त्याः। अतश्चाह — **प्रसक्तस्यानभिनिर्वृत्तस्येति।**

उपोयत इति। उभयपदाश्रयो गुणो बहिरङ्गः। एवमपि प्रसक्तोऽनभिनिर्वृत्तः शक्यते प्रतिषेद्धुं निवृत्त इति (?)। **[औ]यत इति।** आटो बहिरङ्गनिमित्तत्वात्

वृद्धिरपि [बहि]रङ्गा। **लौयमा[नि]रिति**। बाह्यनिमित्तमपेक्ष्य वृद्धिः। **अनेनिज (?) इति। परेण रूपेण व्यवहितत्वात्**। पूर्वपक्षः कथम्? यथा पुगन्तलघूपधस्येति। यस्य गुणो विधीयते तत् क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेष्यत इति। उत्तरपक्षः — अभ्यास[स्य]-गुणः, स च व्यवहित इति।

[२.४] **धातुं क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेषयिष्यामः**। स्वरितकरणात् प्रकरण-प्राप्तो धातुः। तत्रार्थो वानुमीयते, शब्दो वा। अर्थोऽनुमीयतेऽसंनिहितार्थो, योऽथ शब्दं प्रयुङ्क्ते। शब्दो वानुमीयमानो येनार्थोऽनुमी(? °र्थोऽवसी)यते। इति संशब्दिताच्च अन्यदेव वाक्यान्तरमुपक्रमते प्रतिपादकमिति। 'क्ङिति धातोरनन्तरस्य गुणो न भवति' इति इदं वाक्यमुपजायते।

यदि धातुर्विशेष्यते विकरणस्य न प्राप्नोति। अयमभिप्रायः — नैवमर्थं धातुग्रहणमनुवर्त्यते, विकरणस्य मा भूत् प्रतिषेध इति। अस्ति तदनुवृत्तेः प्रयोजनम्, अनुवृत्तिसामर्थ्यात् शक्यमप्रधानस्य विशेष[ण]मभ्युपगन्तुमिति। **विहितविशेष[णं] धातुग्रहणम्**। सोपस्कारत्वात् सूत्रस्य वाक्यशेषोऽध्याह्रियते। धातोर्यः संबन्धी तस्मिन् न भवति। कश्च धातोः संबन्धी? यस्तस्माद् विहित इति। इतरो धातोर्विहितस्य न भवतीति इमं वाक्यशेषं समर्थ्याह — **धातोरेव तर्हि न प्राप्नोति** इति। इ[त]रः क्ङितीत्येतस्य तुल्यविषयवाक्यशेषत्वं समर्थयते — **नैवं विज्ञायते** इति।

अथ वा, कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमिति। कथमियं परिभाषा? उच्यते। 'गुणवृद्धी' इत्येतदनुवर्तते। अतो यत्र गुणवृद्धी 'गुणवृद्धी' इत्येवं विधीयेते तत्रानेनो-पस्थातव्यमिति। इह च 'पुगन्तलघूपधस्य' (पा. ७. ३. ८६) इति गुणो विधीयते इत्युपस्थातव्यमनेन। तत्रैकवाक्यभावापन्नस्य पुगन्तलघूपधस्य क्ङिति नेति वचनात् 'येन नाव्यवधानं तेन व्यवहितेऽपि वचनप्रामाण्यात्' इति प्रतिषेधो भविष्यति।

अथ वा, यदेतस्मिन् योगे इति। यद्यपि परिभाषा न स्याद्, एवमपि गुणवृद्धी अपेक्षितप्रतिषेधे [प्रतिषेध्ये] न प्रवर्तेते। इतरथा हि प्रवृत्ते अशक्ये प्रतिषेद्धु-मिति। इदमपि क्ङितीति प्रतिषेधरूपं प्रतिषेध्यापेक्षमेवानन्तर्यं प्रतिपद्यते। अतो यावन्तः प्रतिषेध्याः यथाभूतास्तावन्ति प्रतिषेधसूत्राणीति पुगन्तलघूपधगुणे प्रतिषेध्ये-ऽनवकाशः प्रतिषेध इति व्यवहितेऽपि प्रवर्तते।

अन्ये वर्णयन्ति — कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषं प्रदर्शितम्। इदानीं यथोद्देशे परिहार उच्यते इति। प्रधानानि भिन्नानि गुणदेशमुपसंपद्यमानानि गुणभेदं प्रयुञ्जते। तत्र क्ङितीत्यस्य **प्रतिप्रधानमिमान् योगान् प्रतिपद्यामहे।**

अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति इति। [इ]दं लिङ्गमनन्तरपरिभाषा नोपतिष्ठते इहेति। उपतिष्ठमाना वा निर्दिष्टाङ्गविकला पूर्वमात्रस्य प्रतिपादयन्त्युपतिष्ठते। अथ वा, गुणभूतयोर्वृद्धिगुणयोर्विशेषणम्। यस्य वा गुण उच्यते, स क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेष्यत इति।

[३] न लुमता तस्मिन् इति। पाठान्तरं गृहीत्वोच्यते। अथापि यथान्यासम्, एवमपि लुमतेतीत्थंभूतलक्षणे तृतीया। लुमता च [य]स्याङ्गत्वं लक्षितं तस्य कार्यं न भवतीति। अथाङ्गस्येति च स्वर्यते **एवमपि .... कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमिति** तद्देशमेवेदम्। इह तु लाघवार्थोऽस्योपदेश इति।

अथ वा, बहिरङ्गो गुणः, अन्तरङ्गः प्रतिषेधः। तत्रासतः प्रतिषेध्यस्य कथं प्रतिषेधेन निवृत्तिः स्यात्?

अथ वा, पूर्वस्मिन् योगे यदार्धधातुकग्रहणं तदनवकाशम्। ननु चोभयविशेषणार्थमार्धधातुकग्रहणं सावकाशमुच्यते। सत्यम्। यदि त्वसत्यार्धधातुकग्रहणे बहुव्रीहिरस्ति यथा 'एकाचो द्वे ....' (पा. ६. १. १) इत्यत्र, तत एतदुपपन्नम्। रोरवीतीति लोपस्यातन्निमित्तत्वात् नैवास्ति प्रतिषेधः। तत्रेदमार्धधातुकग्रहणमेवमर्थं यावती धातुलोपे प्रतिषेधप्राप्तिस्तावती सार्वधातुके न भवतीति। येऽपि सावकाश[त्व]मार्धधातुकग्रहणस्य वर्णयन्ति—इह मा भूत् जोहोर्ति इति, [त] एवं पर्यनुयोज्याः — नैतत् हुर्छारूपम्, जुहोतेरेष 'देवा अदुह्र'वत् रुडागम इति।

[४] इह कस्मान्न भवति — लैगवायनः, कामयते। तदपवादपक्षे ओर्गुणोऽपीग्ल[क्ष]ण इति। **तद्धितकाम्योरिक्ल[क्ष]णात्।** तदपवादपक्षः परित्यक्तः। षष्ठीप्रादुर्भवनं तच्छेषत्वं स्थितम्। तस्मादिग्लक्षणो न भवति। 'इकः' इति वर्तते, 'गुणवृद्धी' च। तेन 'गुणवृद्धी' इत्येवं ये गुणवृद्धी इकस्ते न भवत इति।

[५] लकारस्य ङित्त्वादादेशेषु स्थानिवद्भावः (वा. ५)। स्थानिवद्भावात् कार्यमनपेक्षितशास्त्रमादेशः प्रतिपद्यते, स्थानिवद् गुणवृद्धी न भवत इत्येतावन्मात्रम्। अथ वा, शास्त्रमनपेक्षितनिमित्तम्। क्ङितीत्येतच्छास्त्रं स्थानिवदादेशे

ऽपि प्रवर्तते, किं निमित्तमस्ति नास्तीत्येतन्नापेक्षते । यदि वा व्यपदेशोऽनपेक्षितार्थसंनिधानः, किमस्य ङकारो[ऽस्ति] नास्तीति ।

सर्वप्रकारश्च स्थानिवद्भाव इह नोपपद्यते, अल्विधित्वात् । यथा प्रदीव्येति वलादित्वाभावः ।

यद्येवं ल्यपि गुणः प्राप्नोति । तस्मादिदमत्र वर्ण्यते — स्थान्याश्रये अल्याश्रीयमाणे प्रतिषेधः । अनुबन्धस्तु स्थानिनि नैवास्ति, यो हीत्संज्ञः स इह नास्तीति प्रतिज्ञानात् । वल् तु संनिहितः स्थानिनि, तेन प्रतिषेधो भवति ।

एवमपि गुणेनेह भवितव्यम् । एवं ह्युक्तं तृतीयेऽध्याये ' पिन्न ङित्, ङिच्च पिन्न भवति ' इति । तत्राचिनवम् इति ङित्त्वात् पित्त्वं न भवति, पित्त्वाच्च ङित्त्वं न भवति [इ]त्युच्छिन्नयोः पित्त्वङित्त्वयोः सार्वधातुकाश्रयो गुणः सिद्ध एव ।

भाष्यकारस्येयं कल्पना न वाक्यकारस्येति इदं चोद्यते ।

[५.१] यासुटो ङिद्वचनात् सिद्धम् । लिङो ङित्त्वात् तदादेशा ङित एव, तेषां च भक्तो यासुडिति सिद्धं ङित्त्वम् । पश्यति तु [आचार्यो] नास्ति ङित्त्वं स्थानिवद्भावात् इति, अतो यासुटो ङित्त्वमारभते । यद्येतत् ज्ञाप्यते, कथं **' नित्यं ङितः ' ' इतश्च '** (पा. ३. ४. ९९, १००) इति । अत्र चोद्यते — न हि तत्रैवं वर्ण्यते, ङित आदेशस्य लोप इति । एवं हि विज्ञायमाने पचावः, पचन्ति इत्यत्र लोपः स्यात् । कथं तर्हि ? ङितो लकारस्य यानि परस्मैपदानि तेषामिति । तत्र कथं कृत्वोच्यते, ' यद्येतत् ज्ञाप्यते, कथं " नित्यं ङितः ", " इतश्च " इति ' ? अयमभिप्रायः — यासुटो ङित्त्वात् प्रवर्तमानं प्रतिषेधस्य ङित्त्वं प्रति तत्रानुमानं तथा कल्पयितव्यं यथा ङित्त्वं सुप्रतिषिद्धं भवति । कथं च ङित्त्वं सुप्रतिषिद्धम् ? यदि स्थानिन एव ङित्त्वव्यपदेश उच्छिद्यते । नूनं लकार एव ङिदिति व्यपदेशं न लभते, येन यासुटो ङित्त्वमुच्यत इति । किमर्थं ङित्करणं चैतत् ? विशेषकार्यप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् — ' लिङः सीयुट् ' (पा. ३. ४. १०२), ' लुङ्[लङ्]लृङ्क्ष्वडुदात्तः ' (पा. ६. ४. ७१) इति ।

ङिति यत् कार्यं तन्न भवति । ङितो यत् कार्यं तद् भवति । सूत्रार्थो यथैव ङितो लकारस्य आदेश इति तत्र स्थानिवद्भावो [न] भवति, न तु व्यपदेश एव व्युच्छिद्यते । कुत एतदिति चेत् — यासुट एव ङिद्वचनात् । अनुमानं हि यन्न शक्यते कल्पयितुं तन्न कल्पयितव्यम् । न च शक्यते कल्पयितुम्, यथाजाती[य]कं कार्यं

ङिति, यासुटि तथाजातीयकं कार्यं न। ननु प्रवृत्त आदेशे ङिति इकः षष्ठीनिर्देशो ऽस्ति। यस्तु ङिदिति व्यपदेशस्तत्र नास्ति स्थानिवद्भाव इति। एवं सत्युभयं [अनु]-गृहीतं भवति — यासुटश्च ङित्त्वम्, इदं च 'नित्यं ङितः', 'इतश्च' इति। इतरथा हि केदं स्यात्? सर्वो ङित्त्वव्यपदेश उच्छिद्येत लिङ्गात्। किं च कार्यं यासुटि? क्ङितीति प्रतिषेधः संप्रसारणं च। तन्निमित्तग्रहणं च परि[त्यक्तुं] शक्यम्। अतो यासुटो ङित्त्वं तस्यैवानुमानं स्थानिवद्भावात् ङित्त्वं नास्तीति।

यस्तु व्यपदेशो लकारस्य ङित् इति तस्य निवृत्तौ लिङ्गमित्येतदाचष्टे — **अपर्याप्तश्चैव हि यासुट् समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे।** अपर्याप्तः असमर्थः। समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे कर्तव्ये असमर्थश्चेन्नास्ति यासुटो ङित्त्वेन समुदाये क्ङितीति प्रतिषेधो गुणस्य। अस्ति च स्थानिवद्भावेन ङित्त्वं समुदायस्येत्यनर्थकं यासुटो ङित्त्वमिति।

ननु चावयवे हि कृतं लिङ्गं समुदायस्य विशेषकं भवतीति पर्याप्त एव यासुट् समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे। उच्यते। आगमा असमर्था इति शास्त्रे दर्शनमस्ति। 'ट्युट्युलौ तुट् च' (पा. ४. ३. २३) इति तुट एव टित्करणात् सिद्धे प्रत्ययस्य टित्त्वे किमर्थं प्रत्ययौ टितावुच्येते? दोषः खल्वपि स्यात् — अग्निचित् ब्राह्मणी इति। तुक उगित्त्वात् समुदाय उगिति ङीप् स्यात्। नैष दोषः। 'उगित्यञ्चतिग्रहणात् सिद्धमधातोः' (पा. ४. १. ६, वा. ३) इत्येव न संभविष्यति 'उ[खा]स्रद् ब्राह्मणी'ति। इह तर्हि 'पठिता विद्या' इति इटः टित्त्वात् ङी[प्] प्राप्नोति। न्यायश्चायं यदनवकाशमव्यवेति लिङ्गात् समुदायस्य विशेषकमागमानां तदेव विधौ चरितार्थं तावन्मात्रं च। शक्येते संप्रसारणगुणप्रतिषेधौ कर्तुमितीदमुच्यते — **अपर्याप्तश्चैव [हि] यासुट् समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे।**

[५.२] इदमिति अपरे वर्णयन्ति। 'नित्यं ङितः' इत्ययमेवार्थो ङितामादेशानामिदं कार्यमिति। पचावः, पचन्ति इति कस्मान्न भवतीति? इदं तत्रोक्तं सार्वधातुकमपित् ङि[द्व]दिति। ङितीव ङिद्वदिति सप्तम्यर्थे वतिर्भवति [इ]ति पूर्वस्य योऽतिदेशस्तत्रेदं यासुटो ङिद्वचनम्। एकत्र स्थानिवद्भावात् अस्ति व्यपदेशो ङित इति षष्ठीनिर्देशः। यस्तु ङितीति व्यपदेशः तत्र नास्ति स्थानिवद्भाव, इत्येवं सत्युभयमनुगृहीतं भवति, यासुटश्च ङित्त्वमिदं च 'नित्यं ङितः' इति। इतरथा हि केदं स्यात् (अक्ङित इति)? यदि सर्वो ङिद्व्यपदेशो लिङ्गादुच्छिद्येत इत्येतदनुमीयते।

[५.३] अन्येषां ग्रन्थः। अ(?सु)पर्याप्तश्चैव हि यासुट् समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे'। अ(?सु)पर्याप्तश्चैव हि यासुट् भक्तत्वात्। अथ वा यासुट्-समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे सुपर्याप्तः, लिङिति वाक्यशेषः। ङितं चैनं करोति। क[स्य? थं?] लिङ्गम्? एवं तर्ह्ययमे[तदे]वाभ्युपगच्छति — यासुट् परस्मैपदेषूदात्तो ङिच्च लिङ् भवतीति।

अपरे वर्णयन्ति। उदात्तो ङिच्चेत्यनेन इदमतिदिश्यते — ङितीव चास्मिन् कार्याणि भवन्तीति। यदि च स्थानिवद्भावात् ङितीति व्यपदेशः कार्यं वा लभ्येतानर्थकं ङित्करणं स्यादिति।

दीधीवेवीटाम् ॥ १. १. ६ ॥

[१] दीधीवेव्यो(ः छ)न्दोविषयत्वात् ॥ वा. ॥ एतयोस्तावद् भाषायां नास्ति प्रयोगः।

दृष्टानुविधित्वाच्च ॥ वा. ॥ ननु च भाषायामपि दृष्टमेवानुविधीयते, 'लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे' इति। तत्रायमर्थो वर्ण्यते – दृष्टानुविधि[श्च] छन्दसि भवति। अ[थ] न चेदमुदाहरणं छन्दस्यस्ति, आदीध्य(नम्), आदीध्यक इति। नियतशब्दसंबन्धनानि हि च्छन्दांसि। अथ वा दृष्टानुविधित्वादिति। यथैव गुणो न दृष्ट इत्यनुविधानं क्रियते, एवं गुणोऽपि दृश्यते, तदर्थमनुविधानं कर्तव्यम्। अथ मन्यसे, कथं ज्ञायते गुणो दृश्यत इति? अतः प्रतिपादयति अदीधेत्, अदीधयुरिति (वा.)। न (?स) च गुणो दृश्यते इत्यतो गुणदर्शनादिति। अथ वा गुणदर्शनादिति एवंप्रकाराण्यन्यान्यपि च्छन्दांसि दृष्टानि, तेषां चानुविधानं कृतम्, तन्मध्य एवायमपि प्रक्षेप्तव्य इति। किं पुनस्तदुक्तम्? बहुलवचनम्। अदीधेत्, अदीधयुरिति च गुणोऽपि दृश्यते। अयं च योगारम्भे सति [वचना]दृते न सिध्यति। अदीधेदिति लङो व्यत्ययेन परस्मैपदं भवति। एवमदीधयुरिति च गुणोऽपि दृश्यते।

"प्रजापतिर्वै यत् किंचन मनसादीधेत्। तदाधीतयजुर्भिरेवाप्नोत्, तदाधीतयजुषामाधीतयजुष्ट्वम्" (मैसं. ३. ६. ४)।

एतन्निरुक्तं ध्यायतेर्वर्ण्यते। अयं हि तत्र व्याख्यानग्रन्थः – "प्रजापतिर्वै यत् किंचन मनसाध्यायत् तदेतैराप्तवान्" इति। तथा — होत्राय वृतः कृपयन्नदीधेत्

(ऋ. १०. ९८. ७) इति। अयमपि ध्या[य]तेरेव। “होत्राय वृतः कृपायमाणोऽन्वध्यायत्” (नि. २. १२) इति। एवं च सति दीधीङः कोऽभिसंबन्धो यदुच्यते गुणदर्शनादिति। नैष दोषः। दीधीङ एवै[तद्] रूपम्, अर्थस्तु धात्वन्तरेण तदर्थेनाख्यायते। यथा क्षणोतेः क्ष्णौतिनार्थो वर्ण्यते — ‘क्षणः क्षणोतेः, प्रक्ष्णुतः कालो भवति’ (नि. २. २५)। क्ष्णौतिः क्षयकर्मा इति।

[२] **भवेदिदं युक्तमुदाहरणम्** योगप्रत्याख्याने। इदं तु सत्यपि योगे नैव दुष्यति — **अदीधयुरिति। अयं जुसि गुणः प्रतिषेधविषयमवगाहत इति। नैष दोषः। तुल्यजातीयं बाधते। कश्च तुल्यजातीयः? प्रत्ययाश्रयः।** तेन हि तस्य तुल्यकालता। अयं त्वनाश्रित्य प्रत्ययं प्रकृतिमात्राश्रयः प्रतिषेधोऽन्तरङ्गत्वात् प्रवृत्तः कथमवरकालेन जुसि गुणेन बाध्यत इति? स्यात् मतं — प्रतिषेधो न प्रत्ययमन्तरेणेति। यद्यप्येवं तथापि शब्दवदुपादानं प्रत्ययस्य नास्ति।

अथ वा, येन नाप्राप्त इति। येन नाप्राप्ते = ये[न] नाप्रसक्ते, येन वा हेतुना तं विधिर्बाधते। कुतः? तं प्रत्यनवकाशत्वात्। येन तु प्राप्ते चाप्राप्ते च तं प्रति सावकाशत्वं भवति, यो विषयो नावष्टब्धः स विषयस्तस्येति। एतत् तु मिथः शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यपेक्षायां संभवति। यदा तु युगपत् अनेकशास्त्रप्रतिसंधा[नं] [भ]वति तदा [अनेकशास्त्रप्रवृत्तिः] युगपदपेक्ष(? °क्ष्य)ते। तदानवकाशत्वात् सर्वमेव बाधते। यदापि कार्यमात्रपरिग्रहस्तदापि सर्वो विषयः कार्येणावष्टब्ध इति बाधकत्वमेव भवति।

[३] **कथं दीध्यदिति।** एकदेश उदाहरणत्वेनोपन्यस्तः। कश्चित्तु निपूर्वस्य प्रयोगः — ‘ऐन्द्रः प्राणो अङ्गे अङ्गे नि दीध्यत्’ (मैसं. १. २. १७) इति। असति योगे गुणः प्राप्नोति लेतव्यमिति (? दीधयदिति)। **दीध्यदिति [च] श्यन् व्यत्य[ये]न** (वा. २)। श्यनोनित्त्वादाद्युदात्तत्वम्, ङित्त्वाद् गुणप्रतिषेधो, ‘यीवर्णयोः’ (पा. ७. ४. ५३) इति लोपे, निघातश्च ‘तिङ्ङतिङः’ (पा. ८. १. २८) इति। एवं शेऽपि ङित्वात् गुणे प्रतिषिद्धे, निघाते, यणादेशे च तुल्यम्। एवं च केचित् पठन्ति — **दीध्यदिति [च] ‘श’ व्यत्ययेने**ति। येषां शब् व्यत्ययेनेति पाठः, तेषामपि गुणः प्राप्नोति।

अथेह कथं, ‘मनसा दीध्यज्जुहोति’ (मैसं. ३. ६. ४) इति? शत्रन्तमेतत्। अत्र यदि श्यन् क्रियते नुमा भवितव्यम्, ‘उगिदचाम् ....’ (पा. ७. १. ७०) इति, यस्तस्य (? अभ्यस्तस्य) व्यवधानात्। स्वरस्तु नित्त्वात् सिद्धः। अथ

शः क्रियते नास्ति दोषः, य[स्मा]च्छतुर् 'अदुपदेशात्' (पा. ६. १ .१८६) इति निघाते, एकादेशे च कृते, नुमः प्रतिषेधो 'नाभ्यस्ताच्छतुः' (७. १. ७८) इति।

अथापि 'शब् व्यत्ययेन' इति, एवमपि व्यत्यय इत्येवं वर्ण्यते -- शपो व्यत्ययेन=शपो व्यतिगमनेन 'अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः' (पा. २. ४. ७२) इति, सिध्यति। तस्य हि व्यतिगमेऽस्ति शत्रानन्तर्यमिति।

[४] इडिति वर्तमाने नेड् वशि कृति (पा. ७. २. ८) इति, पुनरिड्ग्रहणमेवमर्थम् -- [इड्] इडेव, रूपान्तरं न प्रतिपद्यते। अविकृतरूपोऽवतिष्ठत इति।

आङ्गं यत्कार्यं तन्नियम्यते। अङ्गस्येत्येतद् अनुवर्तते। तेन 'अङ्गस्य' इति यदुच्यते तत्र न इड्रूपं निवर्तत इति। कथं ग्रहीता? व[च]नाद् भवति। कथं पिपठीषि ब्राह्मणकुलानि? अङ्ग[स्य] इति नियमात् 'सान्तमहतः' (पा. ६. ४. १०) इति दीर्घत्वं न प्राप्नोति। ननु च नुमैवात्र [न] भवितव्यम्, 'नपुंसकस्य झलचः' (पा. ७. १. ७२) इति। (नुमि कृते) तत्र अतो लोपे (पा. ६. ४. ४८) कृते झलन्तता नास्ति, स्थानिवद्भावात्। एवं तर्हि अजन्त इत्येवं भविष्यति। इदमपि मिदचोऽन्त्यात् परस्यैव नुम् इति अपूर्वविधिः। (एवमपि) इकारोऽन्त्यो न भवति स्थानिवद्भावात् इति नास्ति 'मिदचोऽन्त्यात् परः' (पा. १. १. ४७) इति। तस्मात् 'पिपठिषि ब्राह्मणकुलानि' इति भवितव्यम्।

अथ वासिद्धं दीर्घत्वम्, तस्यासिद्धत्वात् नियमो न भविष्यति। अस्मिन् शास्त्रे दीर्घत्वस्याभावात् अविकृतरूप एवायं, प्रयोगे एव विकृतरूप इति। तत्र त्वयं दोषो दृश्यते -- अलावीत्, अपावीत् इति न प्राप्नोति। स्यान्मतम् -- इडनिटोरयमादेश इति। तच्च न। इह द्वयोः षष्ठीनिर्दिष्टयोर्यः स्थाने भवति, लभतेऽसावन्यतरव्यपदेशम्। तस्मात् इदमेव ज्यायो दृश्यते, आङ्गं यत्कार्यं तन्नि[य]म्यत इति।

हलोऽनन्तराः संयोगः ॥ १. १. ७ ॥

[१] कथमिदं विज्ञायते? कुतः प्रश्नः? शब्दाश्रयस्तावदनुपपन्नः। अनन्तरशब्दस्य श्रुतत्वात्। अनेकार्थत्वात् अन्तरशब्दस्य प्रश्नः। अयं हि य[प]न्नात्यविवरप्रदेशबहिर्योगोपसंव्यानेषु दृष्टः इति। एषां संभवात् विवरार्थ एवेति नायं प्रश्नः।

अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते ? अविद्यमानमन्तरं येषाम्। अन्तरम्, विवरम्, छिद्रम्, मध्यम् इति पर्यायाः। किंभूतं पुनः शब्दस्य विवरम् ? वर्णशून्यो योऽन्तरालकालः। आहोस्विदविद्यमाना अन्तरा एषामिति। अत्र द्वितीया प्राप्नोति, तस्या उत्तरत्र परिहारं वक्ष्यामः। केषांचिद् ग्रन्थः — अविद्यमानमन्तरं येषामि[ति]। अस्मिन् द्वितीयस्या अप्रवृत्तिरेव।

किं पुनरिदं विग्रहपदं पृष्ठतः पठितव्यम् ? नेत्याह। किं तर्हि ? एतदसौ पृच्छति – द्वौ इमौ शब्दौ स्तः 'हलोऽनन्तरा' इति। एकोऽवस्तुभूतेनाधिकरणेन विशेषिते अन्यपदार्थे वर्तते। अन्योऽपि [अ]व्यावृत्तेनाधिकरणेना[ना]धेयाकाङ्क्षेण। अथ वा एक एवायं शब्दोऽनेकशक्तिः। लक्ष्यानुरोधात् कः शब्दः आश्रितः किंशक्तिर्वेति।

अवग्रहे संयोगसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति। अप्स्वित्यप्सु इति। विद्यते ह्यत्रान्तरम्। अर्धमात्राकालो ह्यवग्रह इष्यते। अर्धमात्राकालं स्थित्वा वर्णान्तरमुच्चार्यते। कः पुनर्दोषः स्यात् ? 'गुरोरनृतोऽनन्त्यस्य' (पा. ८. २. ८६) इति प्लुतो न स्यात्। ननु चाधिकरणवाचिनो नास्ति संबन्धो गुरोरनृतादिभिः। एवं तर्हि अप्सव्य इत्यत्र न स्यात्।

यथा न दोषस्तथास्तु। शिष्टप्रयोगानुविधायि इदं शास्त्रम्। तत्र यथा शिष्टप्रवृत्तिर्न विरुध्यते, तथाश्रीयत इति। नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्। दोषनिवृत्त्यर्थं वा संयोगसंज्ञाश्रीयेत, प्रयोजनप्रवृत्त्यर्थं वा। न चात्राप्रवर्तमानायां दोषो नापि प्रवर्तमानायां प्रयोजनमिति नैवात्र संयोगसंज्ञा प्रवर्तते। ननु चोक्तम् — अवग्रहे प्लुतो न स्यात् अप्सव्य इति। नैतस्मिन्नवग्रहमिच्छन्ति। व्याकरणेऽप्येकपदे संहिताविधेयस्यावग्रहस्य लक्षणमेव नास्ति। केवलं हि संहिता चासंहिता च व्याकरणे।

अन्ये वर्णयन्ति – यथा परमवाचा इति वाक्छब्दस्य 'तदादि सुबन्तं च' (मभा. १. १६७. १–२) इत्यनुवृत्त्या भसंज्ञा, एवमप्शब्दस्य 'यचि' इति। तन्न। व्यवधानात्। व्यवहितोऽत्राप्शब्दो वाक्शब्दस्त्वनन्तर इति।

इदं(?ह) तर्हि [न] प्राप्नोति, अप्सुयोनिः, अप्सुमतिरिति। 'अपो योनियन्मतिषु' (पा. ६. ३. १, वा. ७) इति अलुकि कृते। अत्रापि नास्ति अव[ग्र]हः। एवं हि पठ्यते— 'समासपदानामन्तोऽवगृह्यते' इति। समासपदं च सह सुपा, नाप्शब्द इति।

[२] संयोगसंज्ञा[याः] च शास्त्रे (च) प्रत्येकं संबन्धोऽन्यत्र सहवचनात्। आनन्तर्यं तूपलक्षणार्थम्, आनन्तर्येणोपलक्षिताः प्रत्येकं संज्ञां प्रतिपद्येरन्। यथानन्तर्येणावस्थितेभ्यो ब्राह्मणेभ्यः पाद्यमाचमनीयं दीयतामित्यानन्तर्येणोपलक्षिताः प्रत्येकं प्रतिपाद्यन्ते, यत् त्वसंभवि तत् साधारण्येन प्रतिपद्यन्ते। 'कन्या दीयतामेभ्यः' इति ज्ञायते दासी इयमेभ्यो दीयतामिति।

यथान्यत्रापि। यदि समाससंज्ञायां सहग्रहणं न क्रियते, ततोऽयमर्थः स्यात् —'षष्ठी' (पा. २. २. ८) 'समासः' (पा. २. १. ३) इति षष्ठ्यन्तस्य यदा सुबन्तेन सह प्रयोगस्तदा समाससंज्ञा प्रवर्तेत इति सर्वस्य न स्यात्। द्वयोस्तु प्रयोगे प्रत्येकं स्यात्। ऋक्पादः, राजाश्व इति प्रत्येकं समासान्तः प्राप्नोति, स्वरश्च। एवमुभेग्रहणे सहार्थे अक्रियमाणे द्वे अभ्यस्तसंज्ञे प्रत्येकं स्याताम्। एवमिहानन्तर्यं नैकस्य धर्मो यथान्तादी। किं तर्हि? द्वयोरयं धर्मो, द्वयोश्चानन्तर्येणोपलक्षितयोः अन्तरेण सहवचनं संयोगसंज्ञा प्रत्येकं प्राप्नोति।

किं च स्यात्? अयमभिप्रायः — एकस्यापि तु संयोगसंज्ञायां पूर्वस्य 'संयोगे गुरु' (पा. १. ४. ११) इति सिद्धा गुरुसंज्ञेति। निर्यायादित्येत्वं प्रसज्येत, रेफयकारयोरानन्तर्यात् प्रत्येकं संयोगसंज्ञेति यकारेण संयोगाद्यङ्गं भवति इति। किं निवर्तितम्? यायाद्वायादिति। अथ समुदाये संयोगसंज्ञायां सत्यां द्विर्वचने 'अचो रहाभ्याम् ....' (पा. ८. ४. ४६) इति कृते प्राप्नोति। असिद्धत्वान्न भविष्यति संयोगसंज्ञेति यथोद्देशे परिहारः।

इह च दृषत्करोतीति। संयोगः अन्ते यस्य इति लोपः प्रसज्येत इति। व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन वा।

इह च शक्ता वस्तेति। संयोगादिलोपः प्रसज्येत। ककारतकार[योः सकारतकार]योश्चानन्तर्ये सति सकारककारौ संयोगौ चादी च संयोगादी भवतः। अथापि संयोगयोरादी इति, भवतः सकयोस्त(? सकौ त)कारयोरादी।

संयोगावादी यस्य सोऽयं संयोगादिरिति। ननु चोपसर्जनशब्दस्य संख्याविशेषोपादानं वृत्तौ नास्ति इत्युक्तम्। सत्यमेवैतत्। किं तु पञ्चके प्रातिपदिकार्थे यासौ प्रातिपदिकोपाधिभूता विभक्तिव्यङ्ग्या संख्या, सा वृत्तौ नाश्रीयते। श्रूयमाणायामपि च विभक्तौ न विवक्ष्यते, दास्याःपुत्र इति। क्वचित् तु गम्यत एव संख्याविशेषो,

मासजातः, शौर्पिकः इति। परिमाणेषूपसर्जनेष्वव्यक्तपरिमाणस्यैव एते वाचका इति। क्वचित् आदेशरूपेणैव व्यज्यन्ते, तावकीनो मामकीन इति। एवमिहादिशब्दोपादानादाश्रितः संख्याविशेषव्यापारः। कथम्? एतावत् वक्तव्यम् ' संयोगादात ' इति। अङ्गस्य यः संयोगस्तस्मात् परो य आकारः तस्यैत्वं भवतीति। सोऽयमादिशब्दः एवमर्थमुपादीयते, अस्मिन् वाक्य उपसर्जनपदे आश्रितः संख्याविशेषः इति। यदि च समर्थो भवति उपसर्जने तत् आदिशब्दोऽर्थप्रकरणस्थानीयः शक्नोति प्रतिपादयितुमिति। यथा ' सारस्वतौ भवतः ' इति कृतैकशेषादयं तद्धित इति लिङ्गादवसीयते— ' मिथुनं ह वा एतद् यदुत सरस्वती च सरस्वांश्च ' इति।

अथ वा अङ्गस्य (पा. ६. ४. १) इत्युच्यते ' आत ' इति च, न च लिङो यकारमात्रमस्त्यङ्गं संयोगात् परम् इत्येवं विज्ञायते — इहानन्तर्यं नोपलक्षण[त]योपन्यस्तम्। किं तर्हि? परिगृहीतानन्तर्यौ संयोगत्वेनाश्रिताविति। निर्यायादिति पूर्वः संयोगोऽवयवो न भवतीति नास्त्येत्वम्।

अथ वा, एतत् प्रतिपद्यामहे – आदिग्रहणात् संयोग इत्येष शब्द आनन्तर्यस्येहोपलक्षणम। यथा वद्धिधिनस्भावादिषूपसर्गशब्दः प्राद्युपलक्षणम्, न तु तेषां संज्ञिभावः प्रादीनां वद्धिधिनस्भावादिषु; एवमिहापि संयोगादेरिति संयोग उपलक्षणमानन्तर्यस्येति एवमेतद् विज्ञायते – अङ्गस्य संबन्धिनौ अनन्तरौ यत्रादी तत्राकारस्यैत्वमिति संख्याविशेषग्रहणमादिशब्दात् प्रतीयते—आनन्तर्या(त्) तत्करणमुपलक्षणमेव वा।

संयोगावन्तावस्येति। अत्रापि तथैव ' संयोगस्य पदस्य ' इति तदन्तविधौ सति सिद्धो लोपोऽन्तस्य। तत्रान्तशब्दोपादानादाश्रितः संख्याविशेष इति गम्यते, आनन्तर्यं वाभ्यन्तरीकृतम्, उपलक्षणं वा संयोगशब्दः पदस्य संबन्धिनावनन्तराविति।

नैवं विज्ञायते, संयोगावादी संयोगादी संयोगाद्योरिति। ककारसकारभेदात् स द्विवचनेन प्रदर्श्यते। अथ किमर्थं प्रथमया विनिर्दिश्यते, न षष्ठ्या — संयोगस्यादी संयोगादी इति? एवं मन्यते — आदिशब्दोऽवयववचनः। यथा पदाङ्गादिस्तदवयव इति गम्यते, एवं शक्तितिकारस्य संयोगस्य नावयवः ककारः। अतः प्रथमोपादीयते, संयोगावादी इति। संयोगत्वेनायमादिरयं प्रथम इति।

[संयोगयोरादी इति।] अवयवादिशब्दः समीपवचनो भविष्यति, संयोगस्यादिः समीप इति। यद्येवं, संयोगयोरादी एते इति विज्ञायमाने इह न प्राप्नोति — काष्ठतडिति। न ह्यत्र तृतीय आदिभूतोऽस्ति। इह त्वस्ति — तष्टव्यमिति, षकार[ट]कार-

योरादिः तृतीयः ककार इति। नैष दोषः। झली[ति] तकारस्य निमित्तत्वेनाश्रितत्वात् संयोगयोरादिरित्यनन्तर्भावः। इहापि काष्ठतडिति अन्त इत्येतन्निमित्तम्। तस्मात् सकारककारयोः संयोगयोः झलि पदान्ते चादे(? ेद्यो)र्लोप इत्येव सूत्रार्थः। यद्येवं, संयोगस्यादिरित्यत्रापि न दोषः। शक्तेति तकारः संयोगस्यादिरित्यादीविशेषण उपक्षीणो निमित्तत्वेन न प्रवर्तते, न चान्यो झलस्तीति न भविष्यति लोपः। तत्रेदमेवानेनोपायेनोक्तं भवति, 'स्कोः संयोगाद्योः' (पा. ८. २. २९) इत्यत्र नोपसर्जनपदं प्रथमान्तम्। किं तर्हि? षष्ठ्यन्तमिति। निर्यातो निर्वात इति। अत्रापि धातुग्रहणात् आदिग्रहणाच्च तथैव कल्पयितव्यम्।

[२.१] कथं कृत्वा एकैकस्येति। अयमभिप्रायः — न्यायाद[वि]शिष्टमेतत्। आनन्तर्यं च संयोगसंज्ञायां श्रुतं किमिति नाभ्यन्तरीक्रियते? यथा 'आनय तौ [शुक्लवाससौ' इति] शुक्ले वाससी अन्तर्भवतः। न च नास्ति संभवो यत्राभ्यन्तरीक्रियते, लक्ष्यस्य च लोक एवंभूतस्य दृष्टत्वात्। यथा शतदण्डन एवंभूतमेव शतरूपं यदभीप्सितं तदेव प्रवर्तते, न गर्गाः [प्रत्येकं] शतं दण्ड्यन्ते। एवमानन्तर्यमप्येवंरूपमेव यदाभ्यन्तरीक्रियते संयोगसंज्ञायामिति।

[३] अथ यत्र बहूनामानन्तर्यम्, किं तत्र द्वयोर्द्वयोः [संयोगसंज्ञा भवति], आहोस्वित् अविशेषेण? कोऽत्राविशेषोऽभिप्रेतः? प्रकरणाविशेषो, यत् प्रकृतं द्वयोरित्येष विशेषो नाश्रीयते संयोगसंज्ञायाम्। एष चेन्नास्ति, बहूनामिति। उत्तरत्र शब्दाविशेषं वक्ष्यति—'अथ वा पुनरस्तु अविशेषेण, द्वयोर्बहूनां चेति'। बहूनामानन्तर्ये कथं बहूनामेव मन्यते, न द्वयोः? उच्यते। यथैव द्विर्वचने निमित्तवत्स्ववयवेषु समुदाये च समुदाय एव द्विर्वचनं प्रतिपद्यते, नावयवाः। अथ चैकाज्व्यपदेशः सर्वेषां कथं (? यथा) भवति, पकारस्याकारस्य, [अच्छब्दस्य,] पच्छब्दस्य च, पच्छब्द एव [तु] द्विरुच्यते। एवमिहापि बहवश्चानन्तराः षटराः उष्ट्र इति, षटावप्यनन्तरौ टरावपि। सत्यपि त्वानन्तर्ये निमित्ते च बहुभिरेव प्रतिपन्ना, न द्वाभ्यामिति। यत्र तु द्वावेवानन्तरौ न तयोर्निवर्त्यते संयोगसंज्ञा। द्वयोस्तु कथमित्युत्तरत्र प्रतिपादयिष्यति।

[३.१] समुदाये संयोगादिलोपो मस्जेः। नुमि कृते त्रयाणामानन्तर्यम्। नसजाः संयोगसंज्ञाः, न नसौ नापि सजाविति। मस्जेः सकारलोपो न प्राप्नोति, असंयोगादित्वात्।

[३.२] इह च निर्ग्लेयात् निर्म्लेयात् .... इत्येत्वं न प्राप्नोति। योऽत्र संयोगो ना[सा]वङ्गस्य कश्चिदपि, यश्चा[ङ्ग]स्य नासौ संयोग इति। क तर्हि स्यात्? ग्लेयात् म्लेयादिति।

[३.३] हलोः संयोग इति चेत् द्विर्वचनं न सिध्यतीति। इन्दिद्रीयिषति इत्यत्र हि द्वौ संयोगौ, एकस्य नकार आदिरपरस्यादिर्दकार इत्युभयोः प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति ' न न्द्राः .... ' (पा. ६. १. ३) इति।

[३.३.१] न वाज्विधेः। एवं ह्युक्तम् ' द्वितीयस्येति न वक्तव्यम्, अजादेरिति पञ्चमी ' (पा. ६. १. २, वा. १) इति। इहापि अजादेरिति वर्तते। तेन य एवासौ वर्णोऽनन्तरः संयोगादिस्तस्य प्रतिषेधो, न दकारस्येति।

[४] आहोस्वित् अन्यतरस्मिन् पक्षे भूयः सूत्रं कर्तव्यमिति। एकस्त्वत्र न्याय्य एव पक्षो बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञेति। इतरस्मिंस्तु पक्षे यत्नः कर्तव्यः यदि तथा लक्ष्यं [न] सिध्यति। गतमित्याह। अयमभिप्रायः—सत्यपि बहूनां संभवे यदि तथाभूतोऽर्थ इहोपात्तो योऽत्यन्तमसंभवी बहूनां, द्वयोर्द्वयोर्भवितव्यमिति।

तदैवं विग्रहः करिष्य[ते], अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषामिति। अनन्तरशब्दोऽविवरवाची। बहवश्चानन्तर्येऽविवराः। अच्छिद्रौ द्वावप्यविवरौ। तयोस्तु द्विर्वचन(वत्) संयोगसंज्ञा न प्रवर्तते। न त्वेवं (वि?)ग्रहीतव्यम्, एषामिति बहुवचनोपादानात् द्रव्याश्रयमेतद् बहुवचनम्। इतरथा हि द्वयोर्न स्यात्। यदा [द्वयोर्] द्वयोस्तदैवं विग्रहः करिष्यते — अविद्यमाना अन्तरा एषामिति। अधिकरणार्थवृत्तोऽन्तराशब्द उपादीयते। यश्चासौ मध्ये भवति नासौ बहूनाम्। किं तर्हि? द्वयोः। यदा च न भवति तदा द्वयोरेव, इति ययोरेव सान्तरत्वमसान्तरत्वं वास्ति, तयोरेव संज्ञया भवितव्यम् इति। एतमर्थमाचष्टे — द्वयोश्चैवान्तरा कश्चिद् विद्यते। ययोरेव विद्यते अन्तरा तयोरेव तदभावे संज्ञया प्रवर्तितव्यमित्याह — न वेति।

[४.१] कथं पुनरत्र षष्ठी, यावता ' अन्तरान्तरेण युक्ते ' (पा. २. ३. ४) इति द्वितीया प्राप्नोति? उच्यते। यदान्तरिणौ भेदेनोपादीयेते ' त्वां च मां च ', ' गार्हपत्यं चाहवनीयं च ' इति, तदान्तरिरूपेण प्रवर्तमानो द्वितीयां प्रतिपद्यते। यदा तूत्सृज्य भेदं संबन्धिरूपेण प्रवृत्तिः, तदान्तरिरूपेणानभिधानात् न ज्ञायते द्वयोरन्तरेत्युक्ते किमन्येन सह द्वयोराहोस्वित् तयोरेव – इति षष्ठी कृता, न द्वितीया। यद्येवम्,

इह कथम् ‘ तद्वाचिनः शब्दस्य प्रयोगमन्तरेण ’ (मभा. १. २४१. ३) इति ? तथा ‘ अन्तरेण वरारोहाम् ’ इति ? उच्यते । अयम् अन्तरेणशब्दो विनाशब्दार्थवचनो मध्यवचनश्च । उभयार्थेनापि योगे द्वितीया विधीयते ‘ अन्तरान्तरेण युक्ते ’ (पा. २. ३. ४) इति ।

[४.२] एवमपि बहूनामेव प्राप्नोति । यान् हि भवानत्र षष्ठ्या प्रतिनिर्दिशति । केचिदेषामिति बहुवचनोपादानात् बहूनामेव भवितव्यमिति वर्णयन्ति । तदयुक्तम्, आनन्तर्योपलक्षणपरे वाक्ये संख्याया अविवक्षितत्वात् । यत्प्रत्या(? याव-त्प्रत्या)य्यानन्तर्यमित्येतावत् वि[व]क्षितम् । इतरथा हि अश्वादिषु न स्यात् । तस्मादेतेनैतत् प्रतिपादयति — अविद्यमाना अन्तरा येषामिति, योऽसावन्तरा इति स द्वयोश्च बहूनां [च] । न चेद् बहूनां, किमर्थं तेषामनन्तराणां संयोगसंज्ञा न प्रवर्तते ? त्रयाणां ह्याद्यन्तौ व्यवहितौ, न तु [मध्]यः । तत्र यदि बहूनामतुल्यजातीयोऽन्तरा स्यात्, न प्रवर्तते बहूनाम् ।

अन्त्यात् पूर्वो मस्जेरिति । तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्, अनुषङ्गलोपार्थम्, मग्न इति ।

[४.३] अथ वा, अविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञा विज्ञास्यते । द्वयोरपि बहूनामिति । कथं कृत्वेदमुच्यते, यावतोक्तं समुदायस्यै[व] भवितव्यं संयोगसंज्ञया नावयवानामिति, यथा समुदायस्यैकाचो द्विर्वचनं नावयवानामिति ? एषोऽभिप्रायः — यथा समुदाये द्विरुच्यमाने अवयवा अपि द्विरुच्चारिता भवन्ति । अयं तु विशेषः, एकः प्रत्यक्षतोऽपरोऽनुमानतः । कार्यप्रतिपत्तिस्तु [तु]ल्या । एवमिह द्विर्वचनवत् यदि समुदायद्वारकं कार्यमवयवानामपि, अथ संयोगकार्यं न प्रतिपद्यन्ते सहभूतानामवयवा इति दृष्टान्तो द्विर्वचनं न भवति । तत्र समुदायद्वारकं कार्यमप्रतिपद्यमाना अर्थिनोऽवयवाः संयोगसंज्ञायाः सति निमित्ते किमिति न प्रतिपद्यन्त इति । यथा च द्विर्वचने विरोधे न शक्यमवयवस्य क्रियमाणे द्विर्वचने अवयवान्तरस्य समुदायस्य च कर्तुमचोऽपहृतत्वात्, एवं संयोगसंज्ञायां नास्ति विरोधः । अस्ति हि संभवो यत् समुदायस्य च स्यादवयवानां चेति ।

[४.४] यदप्युच्यत इति । अयं ग्रन्थोऽस्मादनन्तरं युक्तरूपो दृश्यते ‘ वक्ष्यत्येतत् अन्त्यात् पूर्वो मस्जेरिति ’ (पा. १. १. ४७, वा. २) ।

किं पुनरयं बहूनामेव संयोगसंज्ञा इत्येतस्य परिहारः ? अथाविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञेति ? एकस्तावत् परिहारः, बहूनामेवाभ्युपगम्यायं परिहार इति। तत् कथमिव समुदायेऽकार्यभाजि(नि ?) अवयवा न लभन्ते ? समुदायश्चैजिति वा निर्दिश्यते स्य(?) अथ वा स्वरूपेणैव एओङ् ऐऔजिति। इह त्वनवधारिता हलोऽनन्तराः संयोगसंज्ञाभाजो निर्दिश्यन्ते। तत्राङ्गस्य संयोगादेः (इति) आश्रीयमाणे त्रिव्यञ्जनविषयमानन्तर्यमनाश्रीयमाणं कथमिव द्वयोरानन्तर्यनिमित्तायाः संयोगसंज्ञायाः प्रतिबन्धे वर्तिष्यत इति। अन्ये वर्णयन्ति, सर्वमिदं भाष्यं परपक्षोच्चारणमात्रे निर्दिष्टम्। यदुक्तं भवता — अङ्गेन संयोगो विशेष्यते, यश्चात्र संयोगो नासावङ्गस्य, [योऽङ्गस्य] स संयोगो न भवतीति। एतदसत्। कुतः ? यस्मादविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञा द्वयोश्च बहूनां चेति। अपरे वर्णयन्ति — अनेन ग्रन्थेन एतदुपपादयति, यदेव भवता अप्राप्तिनिमित्तमुक्तमङ्गस्य संयोगविशेषणत्वादिति, तदेव मे प्राप्तिनिमित्तम्। विद्यते ह्यत्राङ्गस्य संयोगादित्वम्, संयोगसंज्ञाया अविशेषेण प्रवृत्तेरिति।

[५] स्वरानन्तर्हिता हलः संयोग[संज्ञा भवन्तीति] पठितव्यम्। इतरथा हि अज्भिर्व्यवहितानामपि प्राप्नोति संयोगसंज्ञा। पचति, पनसमिति। हल इति वचनात् साच्कानां नास्ति प्रसङ्गः। हलामेव तु प्राप्नोति। तत्र पचतीति रूपोदाहरणम्। इदं तु कार्योदाहरणं, पनसमिति। केचिन्मन्यन्ते प्रपाठोऽयमिति। अपरे, वाक्यमि[ति]। एतस्मिन् हलां संयोगसंज्ञायां सत्यां यावत् संयोगसंज्ञाकार्यं ताव[त्] ....।

[५·१] [अनं]त राविमौ ग्रामाविति। सत्यपि व्यवधाने नद्या पर्वतेन वा, अनन्तरव्यपदेशं लभेते। एवमिहापि हलो व्यवहिता अपि लभन्ते अनन्तरत्वमिति कर्तव्यं स्वरानन्तर्हितवचनम्। अनन्तरवचनमिदानीं किमर्थं स्यात् ? एषोऽभिप्रायः — हलावनन्तरावित्युच्यमाने बहूनां नैव स्यात्। बहूनां चाव्य[व]धानात् प्रवर्तत एव संयोगसंज्ञा। द्वयोरपि व्यवहितयोरपि भवितव्यमिति ब्रवीषि। तत्र

[५.१.१] किमर्थमनन्तरवचनमिति ? एकप्रतिषेधार्थम्। अनन्तरवचनेन विषयः परिच्छिद्यते। यत्रानन्तर्यमित्येतदस्ति स विषयो विज्ञेयः संयोगसंज्ञाया इत्येको हल् पर्युदस्तो भवति। ततोऽर्थवदनन्तरवचनम्।

इयेषेति। आम् प्रसज्येत। [गुरु]मद्वचनम् इदानीं [किमर्थं स्यात् ?] यः शुद्ध इजा[दिः] इण् गताविति तन्निवृत्त्यर्थम्।

[५.२] न वातज्जातीयव्यवायात् (वा. ८)। यो हि भिन्नजातीयः व्यवधायकोऽसौ भवति। लोकतोऽस्य दृष्टान्तमुपादत्ते — **एवं हि कंचित् कश्चित् पृच्छतीति। .... वृषलकुलम्** [इति]। अत्र चोद्यते – ननु च ब्राह्मणकुलमपि तुल्यजातीयकं तयोर्व्यवधायकमेव ? नैष दोषः। नैतावदेव, परं तुल्यजातीयं परं व्यवधायकं भवति। यस्तु भवतः पक्षः, अतुल्यजातीयकं च व्यवधायकं नेति, एतत् निवर्त्यते। अतो लोकवदिहापि स्वरव्यवहितानां नास्ति संयोगसंज्ञा। हल्व्यवधानेऽपि नास्ति उष्ट्र इति षकारस्य रेफस्य च, टकारेण व्यवधानात्। त्रयाणां [अ]व्यवधानात्, तथा षटयो रेफटकारयोश्च प्रवर्तत एव च संज्ञेति।

किं पुनः कारणमिति। इह यस्तथा (ह्युभयथा)नन्तरशब्दस्य दृष्टा प्रतिपत्तिः। तत्रोपपत्तिं पृच्छति। कात्रोपपत्तिर्यदनन्तरशब्दः क्वचिद् व्यवहिते प्रवर्तते, क्वचिन्नेति?

इतर एकान्तेनैव व्यवधानमतज्जातीयेनाभ्युपगम्याह — **सर्वत्रातज्जातीयं व्यवधा[य]कमिति। ग्रामशब्दो[ऽयं] बह्वर्थः।** एतदाचष्टे — अनन्तरशब्दोऽत्राविकल्पार्थः। ग्रामशब्दस्तु विकल्पितार्थः। तत्र योऽयं प्रयोगो 'अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ' इति, अत्र ग्रामशब्दस्य कश्चिदर्थविशेषः परिगृह्यते।

[५.३] तत्र बह्वर्थतायां विप्रतिपत्तिः। केचिन्मन्यन्ते — शब्दा एव प्रविभक्तरूपा अनेकवाक्यविषयाः। सारूप्यात् तत्त्वाध्यवसायः। अपरे मन्यन्ते — एक एव शब्दोऽनेकशक्तिः। तस्य त्वर्थवशात् क्वचिदेव शक्तिः कस्मिंश्चित् ए[व] वाक्य आश्रीयत इति। यथा तु भाष्यं, तथा शब्दा एव प्रविभक्ता इति लक्ष्यन्ते। एवं हि निगमनम् — **तद्यः सारण्यक ससीमक इति।** शक्तिप्रविभागाभ्युपगमे हि एवं वक्तव्यम् — 'तद् यदा' इति।

अतो ग्रामशब्दस्तस्यास्तस्याः क्रियाया उपपादनात् वाक्ये वाक्ये तं तमर्थमुपादाय प्रवर्तमानस्तदर्थोपक्षेपक एव। तत्र योऽयं ग्रामशब्दः 'अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ' इति, अयं नित्यमेव सारण्यके ससीमके सस्थण्डिले वृत्त इति नद्या अप्यन्तर्भावात् अनन्तरावेवैतौ। न व्यवहिताविति नैवं व्यवहिते अनन्तरशब्दो वर्तते।

[५.४] अथ यदा ग्रामोऽस्तीति प्रयुज्यते, तदा किं युगपदेतेऽर्थाः प्रत्याय्यन्ते इतः पृथक् पुरुषाः, पृथक् शालासमुदायः, पृथक् च ससीमकं सस्थण्डिलकमिति ? नैवंभूतमस्ति प्रत्यायनम्। सारण्यके ह्यन्तर्भाविताः पुरुषादयः पुनर्निर्देष्टव्या इति नास्ति

संभवः । तस्मात् सर्व एव शब्दाः कस्मिंश्चिद्विशेषे प्रयुज्यन्ते, स तु [कदाचित्] प्रतिपत्त्रा [न] विगृह्यते । एतावत्तु प्रतिपद्यते, कश्चिदेवार्थोऽनेन प्रक्रान्त इति । अतश्च न प्रतिपद्यते, यत्र पृच्छति कोऽत्र भवतोऽभिप्रेत इति ।

[५.५] केषांचि[त्] त्वत्रेदं दर्शनम् — वाटपरिक्षेपेऽस्य मुख्या वृत्तिः। पुरुषादिषु तु गौणी, तात्स्थ्यात् सामीप्याद्वा इति। यथा नन्दिग्रामो मल्लग्राम इति। सत्यपि तन्निवासिनां पुरुषाणामितरेतरगमने न नन्दिग्रामो मल्लग्राम इति संपद्यते, मल्लग्रामो वा [न]न्दिग्राम इति। तेषां तु कर्मनिमित्तमिदं दर्शनम्। एवं हि श्रौतानि स्मार्तानि च कर्माणि अवस्थिता[नि]। "ग्रामे नाध्येयम्", "ग्रामं च न प्रविशेत्" (गौधसू. ३. ३३)। तथा कर्मान्तरम् "न भुक्त्वा न ग्रामे शुक्रियं चेति" (मानव गृ. सू. १. ४. १३–१४)। वाटपरिक्षेपे नाधीयते, तमेव च न प्रविशन्ति, सीम्नि तु पठन्ति, प्रविशन्ति च।

[५.६] अपर एवं मन्यन्ते — सारण्यके ससीमके सस्थण्डिले मुख्या वृत्तिः, समुदायशब्दस्तु [गौण्या] श्रुत्वा(? वृत्त्या)वयवेषु पुरुषेषु वर्तते। यथा 'पूर्वे पञ्चाला' इति।

अस्मिन् दर्शने भाष्यं न [नि]गमितं भवति — ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थ इति। अतोऽस्यैतत् दर्शनम् — यथा अश्व इति नामपदमाख्यातपदं चात्यन्तमितरेतरमनुपकारि स्वार्थे प्रवर्तते, जातिमत्यर्थे ससाधनायां च क्रियायाम्, एवं ग्रामशब्दोऽपीति।

मुखनासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः ॥ १. १. ८ ॥

[१] किमिदं मुखनासिकावचन इति? कुतः प्रश्नः? एवं मन्यते — यथायं शब्दः संशब्द्यते न तथाभूतोऽर्थ उच्यते। एवंभूतो ह्यर्थोऽभिप्रेतः — मुखेन नासिकया यः उच्यते सोऽनुनासिकः इति। शब्दस्त्वेवमवस्थितो, मुखनासिकमवचनमस्येति। तत्र न शब्दोऽर्थस्य सदृशः, नार्थः शब्दस्येति।

[१.१] निपातनाद्दीर्घत्वं भविष्यति। अस्यायमभिप्रायः — न लोकेऽन्यथाभूतः शब्दः शास्त्रे कृतदीर्घ उच्चारितः। किं तु लोकेऽप्ययमेव स्मर्यते। स्मर्यमाणस्य च निपातनसाधुत्वमन्वाख्यायते, यथा "सर्वनामानि" (पा. १. १. २७) इति। इतरथा हि किमिति गुरुनिर्देशं कुर्यात्? मुखनासिकवचन इति न भवितव्यम्।

अथ त्वेवं कल्प्यते — यदेवैतत् प्राकृतमुभयथा शब्दरूपं द्वन्द्वे प्राप्तं, समाहार इतरेतरयोगे वा नित्येनैकवद्भावेन बाधितम्, अनेन तस्य पुनःप्रसवः क्रियते इत्युभयथा भवितव्यम्। अन्ये तु नपुंसकलिङ्गतामेव विभाषयन्ति।

[१.२] नित(? मुख)नासिकावचन इति.... केचित् विपरीतं कल्पयन्ति....। उभयत्र तु नासिका[भागो] मुखवचने भागेऽनुरागं करोति। यथा अन्यवर्णस्थो[ऽनुनासिको]ऽनुरागं करोति सयँ्यन्ता सवँ्वत्सर इति, अकारोऽप्यनुनासिक इव लक्ष्यते। तत्र तु प्रासादवासिन्यायो नास्ति। यथा स्वरिते भागप्रवि[भा]गभावात् नोदात्तव्यपदेशो नाप्यनुदात्तव्यपदेशः। अवयवौ तस्योदात्तानुदात्तौ, समुदायस्तु गुणान्तरयुक्तः। यथा 'कल्माषः' 'सारङ्गः', इति। न भवति ग्रहणं समुदायस्येति। अस्मिंस्तु दर्शने पाणिनिना मुखग्रहणं पठितमिति दृश्यते। चूर्णिकारस्तु भागप्रविभागमनाश्रित्य कृत्स्न एव वर्ण उभयस्थानो यथा भ्राष्ट्रपक्वः किलोखापक्वश्च। तत्र मुखवचनोऽप्यसौ नासिकावचनोऽपि, यथा भ्राष्ट्रपक्वोऽप्यसौ किलोखापक्वोऽपीति प्रासादवासिन्यायेन मुखग्रहणं प्रत्याचष्टे।

[१.३] ईषद्वचनमावचनम्। स हि वर्णो न मुख एव नापि नासिकायामेव वात्मव्यक्तिं लभते। किं तु वायुनान्यतरस्मिन् अनुपरतशक्तिनान्यतरत्र करणेऽभिहन्यमाने स वर्ण आत्मव्यक्तिं प्रतिपद्यत इति। ईषन्मुखस्य व्यापार ईषत् नासिकायाः। अत्रापि सामान्यशब्दस्याव्यावृत्तत्वात् इदमनिवृत्तमेव शब्दरूपं मुखनासिकवचन इति। यो हि ईषदुच्यते, उच्यते ह्यसौ। यथा शुक्लतरो न भवति न शुक्लः, भवत्येव शुक्ल इति। यथा ईषत् दूरं — दूरमेव।

[१.४] मुखद्वितीया वा नासिका वचनमस्य। शाकपार्थिवादित्वात् समासः। मुखद्वितीयेति मुखसहायेत्यर्थः। यथा 'असिद्वितीयोऽनुससार' (मभा. १. ४२६. ८) इति। तत्र साहचर्यात् नासिका मुखमिति व्यपदिश्यते, मुखनासिका वचनमस्येति। अत्रापि न दण्डवारितो द्वंद्वः इत्यव्यापृतो मुखनासिकवचन इति शब्दः।

[१.५] मुखोपसंहिता वा नासिकेति। [केचित्] वर्णयन्ति—पूर्वत्रोत्तरपदलोपो नान्वाख्यातः। इह त्वन्वाख्यातः, 'सिद्धं [तु] समानाधिकरणाधिकारे क्तस्तृतीयापूर्वपद उत्तरपदलोपश्च' (पा. २. १. ३४–३५, वा. ४) इति। एतच्चासत्, लोपस्य तत्र प्रत्याख्यातत्वात्। तस्मादनेनैतत् प्रतिपादयति — नासिकामुखोपसंहितमस्य

स्थानान्तरमन्यदेव। न मुखं नापि नासिका। किं तर्हि ? तयोरन्तरालम्। यथा गङ्गा-यमुनयोर्वेणिका इति। अस्मिन्नपि प्रासादवासिन्यायो दुर्लभः, स्थानान्तरत्वादिति। ननु चैतस्यां कल्पनायां 'टित' (पा. ४. १. १५) इति ङीपा भवितव्यम्, 'मुखनासिका-वचनीकः अनुनासिकः' इति ? नैष दोषः। वचनं प्रधानं मुखनासिकया विशेष्यते। न च प्रधानं गुणलिङ्गं प्रतिपद्यते इत्येवं नासिकावचन इति। यथा विंशतिर्गाव इति गुणिप्रधाने [निर्देशे। गुणप्रधाने]ऽपि निर्देशे न — गवां विंशतिः।

[२] [यमानुस्वाराणामेवेति। असति] चैतस्मिन् न्याये दोष एव भवति। अन्तरतमस्याभावात् 'आङोऽनुनासिकः' (पा. ६. १. १२६), 'अणोऽप्रगृह्य-स्यानुनासिकः' (पा. ८. ४. ५७), 'यरोऽनुनासिक' (पा. ८. ४. ४५) इति एत एव यमानुस्वाराः प्राप्नुवन्ति। ये त्वन्ये '[विड्वनोर]नुनासिकस्यात्' (पा. ६. ४. ४१) इति एवमादयः, तेष्वसंभव एव यमानुस्वाराणाम्। न ह्येते धात्वन्ते भवन्ति इति। येषां तु **'यमानुस्वाराणामपि'** इति ग्रन्थस्तेषां तु प्रासादवासिन्यायो मनसि वर्तते इत्येवं वर्ण्यते। एवं च सत्यन्तर[त]मा एव भविष्यन्ति, न यमानुस्वारा इति। वक्ष्यति 'नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्' इति। **क्वचटतपानामेव प्रसज्येत।** एवं च सति पक्वमिति 'अनुदात्तोपदेश॰' (पा. ६. ४. ३७) इति लोपः प्रसज्येत। ओदनपक्, 'अनुनासिकस्य क्विझलोः' (पा. ६. ४. १५) इति दीर्घत्वम्।

प्रासादवासिन्यायेन। अयं प्रासादवासिन्यायः क्रियानिमित्तेषु व्यपदेशेषु प्रवर्तते, न रूढौ। यथा कश्चित्, न च प्रासादवासित्वं भूमिवासित्वं वा रूढिनिमित्तम्, क्रियानिमित्तमेव इति उभाभ्यां व्यपदिश्यते, एवं व्याकरणेऽपि न नासिकावचन इत्येतत् कस्मिंश्चित् परिभाषितं प्रसिद्धं वेति। क्रियानिमित्तत्वादेव व्यपदेशमुभय-वचनोऽपि वर्णः प्रतिपद्यते।

नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्। आन्तर[त]म्यान्मुखवचनस्य उभयवचनो भविष्यतीति।

[३] **इतरेतराश्रय उक्तम्।** क ? वृद्धिसंज्ञायाम्। इह तु पुनरुच्यते, अस्य [नि]दर्शनार्थम्। अनुनासिकसंज्ञा संहितावसानसंज्ञावत् लोकविदि[त]त्वात् नैवा-रब्धव्या। अथाबुधबोधनार्थमारभ्यते, यो दोषस्तस्मिन् प्रतिविहितमेवेति।

तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं [सवर्णम्] ॥ १. १. ९ ॥

[१] तुल्यस्थानप्रयत्नानां प्रदेशेषु कार्यसंप्रत्ययार्थं स्वरूपग्रहणेन शास्त्रं [गुरु] संपद्यत इति संज्ञाप्रणयनम् । अत्र च यथाश्रुतपदानु[ग्र]हप्रवृत्तेः प्राक् द्वंद्वो योऽदृष्टार्थे स्वरूपग्रहणे प्राप्तः, अथ वा यस्मिन् वृत्त्यर्थे वाक्यमुपन्यस्तं तां वृत्तिमुच्चारयति —

[१.१] तुलया संमितं तुल्यम्, आस्यं च प्रयत्नश्च आस्यप्रयत्नमिति। केचित् तुल्यमिति गुणकल्पनं कुर्वन्ति, तुल्यमिव तुल्यमिति । तत्तु न युक्तम् । सामान्येन प्रयत्नः (?)। तुल्यमिति उक्ते सर्वत्राविशेषेण सदृशे संप्रत्ययो दृश्यते। यत्र च गौणत्वं न तत्रान्तरेणार्थप्रकरणशब्दान्तराभिसंबन्धादि भवति संप्रत्ययः । तस्मात् यत्प्रत्ययान्तो रूढिशब्दोऽयं सदृशसमानसदृक्पर्यायः । व्युत्पत्तिकर्मणि केवलं तुलोपादीयते कस्यचित् शब्दस्यानुगमात् । न त्वत्र तुला नापि संमितत्वम्। यथा कुशलः, प्रवीणः, प्रतिलोमः, अनुलोम इति।

[१.२] किं पुनरास्यम्? किमास्यं मन्यसे, समुदितमथ प्रदेशानिति वाक्योपन्यासोपक्षेप एवम् ।

लौकिकमास्यम् । लोके विदितम् । यथैव पशुरपत्यं देवता तथैवास्यमपीति । किं पुनस्तल्लोके विदितमिति इदमाचष्टे — [ओ]ष्ठात् प्रभृति प्राक् का[क]लकात् । [काकलकं] ग्रीवायामुत्कृष्टः प्रदेश उच्यते ।

कथं पुनरास्यम् ? एवमर्थं पृच्छति । नैतावता निश्चेतुं शक्यते। [ओ]ष्ठात् प्रभृति प्राक् काला(? काकलका)दित्येवमुच्यमाने न ज्ञायते किमोष्ठात् प्रभृति प्राक् काकलकाद्ये प्रदेशास्ते गृह्यन्ते, अथ समुदितमास्यमिति। केचिन्नोदयन्ति । फलाभावात् निर्ज्ञात आस्यशब्दे, अर्थप्रवृत्तिकारणप्रश्नवैयर्थ्यम् । अस्ति फलम् । किं निमित्तमुपादाय प्रवृत्तः, अथानिमित्तो डित्थवत् स्वरूपम् ? यदि निमित्तोपकारी, स्थानविशेषेऽपि वर्तिष्यत इति नास्ति दोष, इति प्रवृत्तिकारणं द्रढयन्तः प्रश्नकारणं दर्शयन्ति ।

इतरो व्युत्पत्तिमाचष्टे — अस्यन्त्यनेन [वर्णानि]त्यास्यम् । कृत्यः करणसाधनः, स्नानीयं चूर्णमिति यथा । येन वर्णानस्यन्ति । असनमत्राभिव्यक्तिः निष्पत्तिर्वाभिप्रेता । वर्णानिति । अनेनासनविशेष एव आख्यायते रूढिविषयः ।

अन्नमेतदास्यं[द]त इति आस्यमिति वा। अनेनैतदाचष्टे — स्यदेर्वार्थे अस्यतिर्वर्तते। अथ वा स्यदेरेवैतदाङ्पूर्वस्य डप्रत्यये रूपमिति। अन्नं चात्र स्यदिविशेषणार्थमुपादीयते। 'एतद्' इति चानेन [आ]स्यमेवाभिसंबध्यते कर्तृभूतं कर्मभूतं वा। अन्नमेतत् प्राप्य द्रवीभवतीति। अथ वा एतदन्नं द्रवीकरोति।

[१.३] अथ कः प्रयत्नः? किं प्रयतनम्, अथ प्रारम्भ इति। प्रपूर्वात् यततेर्भावसाधनो 'न'शब्दः। भावसप्तमानि कारकाणि इति भवति भावः साधनः। अथ वा कर्त्रादीनि यथा साधयन्ति एवं भावो[ऽपि] कारकाणि साधयति, विशिष्टाख्याप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वात्। एवमपि कथं भावेन नशब्दः साध्यते? न साधनशब्दो निर्वर्तकार्थः। किं तर्हि? अभिधेयवाची। अथ वा भावः कैश्चित् साधनत्वेनाभ्युपगम्यते। अभ्यन्तरो भावोऽपि (? हि) प्रकृतो (? °त्यर्थो) निरधिष्ठानो न शक्यो व्यपदेष्टुमिति प्रत्ययार्थो भावः सिद्धरूपतया साधनत्वेनोपादीयते। यथा वानस्पत्यमिति स एव समुदायो भेदा[भेदा]भ्यामाश्रितः प्रकृत्यर्थत्वेन प्रत्ययार्थत्वेन च भवति वनस्पतीनां समूह इति। स च भावः कचित् केनचित् धर्मेण रूढः संबन्धित्वेनोपादीयते 'न'शब्दवाच्यत्वेन।

[१.४] किमास्योपा[दान इति]। नासिकायामपि वर्णा निष्पाद्यन्ते। तद्व्युदासार्थमास्यग्रहणं स्यात्। उच्यते — आस्य एव ते निष्पद्यन्ते, [ऽ]नुनासमात्रं नासिकेति एकं दर्शनम्। अन्ये मन्यन्ते — न चेयं नासिका। किं तर्हि? अन्तरास्येऽस्ति चर्मपुटकं, पणवचर्मवद् विततमिति। तत्संबद्धा च रेखा नासिका। सा वायुनाभिहन्यमाना श्रुतिविशेषे निमित्तं भवतीति।

अकारस्य बाह्यं स्थानम्। तच्चोदयिष्यत्येव। विसर्जनीयश्चोरस्य एकेषाम्। न चास्ति तस्य सवर्णत्वे सत्यसति वा प्रयोजनम्। वक्ष्य[त्ये]तदयं — [प्रयत्न-]विशेषणमास्योपादानमिति। एतदाचष्टे — नास्यायं परीक्षाकालः। अन्यदेव तावद्विचारयिष्यामः। एतदुत्तरकालं परीक्षिष्यामह इति।

[२] सवर्णसंज्ञायां भिन्नदेशेष्वतिप्रसङ्गः। न हि द्वंद्वे शक्यत आस्येन प्रयत्नो विशेषयितुमिति भिन्नस्थानानां जबगडदशामन्तर्वर्ती स्पृष्टतादिः प्रयत्नस्तुल्य एषां, स्पृष्टं करणं स्पर्शानामिति सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति। ततश्च परस्परसावर्ण्ये सति तर्प्ता, ऊर्ग्जः, ऊर्ग्ज्यः इति 'झरो झरि सवर्णे' [पा. ८. ४. ६५] इति लोपः प्राप्नोति।

[२.१] सिद्धं त्वास्ये तुल्यदेशप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्। संज्ञा न भविष्यति। एवमपि किमास्योपादाने प्रयोजनम्? यावतास्यान्तर्वर्तिन एव प्रदेशा इति। [प्रयत्नविशेषणमिति।] इतरो य आस्यान्तर्वर्ती बाह्यश्च न भवति तद्विशेषणार्थमास्योपादानमिति। वर्ग्यो वर्ग्येण सवर्णसंज्ञ इष्यते। ते च परस्परं भिन्नप्रयत्नाः। तत्र मिथस्तेषां सवर्णसंज्ञा न स्यात्। तस्मादास्यग्रहणेन चत्वार एवान्तर्वर्तिनः सवर्णसंज्ञायाः प्रवृत्तिं निवृत्तिं च प्रति आश्रीयन्ते। बाह्यास्तु व्युदस्यन्ते। तांश्च बाह्यान् प्रतिनिर्दिशति — संवारविवाराविति। यथा चैते बाह्यास्तथा शिक्षायां विस्तरेणोपपादितम्।

[२.२] एव[मप्यवर्णस्य] सवर्णसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति। बाह्यं ह्यास्यात् स्थानमवर्णस्य। काकलकस्याधस्तात् उपजत्रु यः प्रदेशः तत् स्थानमवर्णस्य। तच्च बाह्यमास्यात्। ननु चास्यग्रहणं प्रयत्नविशेषणमित्युक्तम्। अवर्णस्य चान्तर्वर्ती प्रयत्नः। एवं मन्यते — यस्य बाह्यं स्थानं प्रयत्नोऽपि तस्य बाह्य इति। अथ वा, स्थानमप्यस्ति बाह्यमित्यतो देशविशेषणमपि संभवत्यास्यग्रहणमिति न दोषः।

सर्वमुखस्थानमवर्णमेक इच्छन्ति। सर्वमेव मुखं व्याप्रियतेऽवर्णनिष्पत्तौ, तेन [न] बाह्यस्थानता संभवत्यस्यां शिक्षायाम्। भिन्नस्थानत्वात् नास्ति अवर्णहकारयोः सवर्णसंज्ञेति एवमर्थं 'नाज्झलौ' (पा. १. १. १०) इति न पठितव्यम्।

एवमपि व्यपदेशो न [प्र]कल्पते आस्ये [ये]षां तुल्यो देश इति। सर्वमुखस्थानत्वे सति कोऽन्यो देशस्तस्मिन् य आधेयत्वेन वाधिकरणत्वेन वा व्यपदिश्यते? व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन व्यपदेशो भवति। यच्च वर्णान्तरविषयमास्यं, यच्चोत्पादनक्रिया[विषयं], यच्चावर्णविषयं सर्वं तदाश्रित्य तस्मिन्निदं तुल्यमवर्णविषयमास्यमिति समुदायावयवकल्पनया भेदः क्रियते। अथ वा, शब्द एव भागोपनिपाती कश्चित् सामान्यरूपेण ब्रवीति तदास्यं, कश्चिद्विशेषरूपेणेत्येवं वा भेदो भविष्यति।

[२.३] न हि लौकिकमास्यम्। ननु च तद्धितान्तमपि लौकिकमेव। एतदाचष्टे — य(? ण्य)त्प्रत्ययान्तमास्यं, यस्य श्रुत्या समधिगमः क्रियते, तन्नाश्रीयते इति। स्थानं करणं च। स्थानं ताल्वादि। करणं केषांचित् स्पृष्टतादि, केषांचित् जिह्वाया अग्रोपाग्रमध्यमूलानि। यद्येवम्, किमर्थं प्रयत्नग्रहणम्? एतावदस्तु — 'तुल्यास्यं सवर्णम्' इति। एतावदेवास्ये भवं – स्थानं प्रयत्नश्चेति। प्रत्येकं व्यापारव्युदासार्थमुभयोरुपादानं, यथैव स्थानं स्थानान्तरनिरपेक्षं स्यात् (?)। एवं च सति स एव दोषो — जबगडदशां तुल्यप्रयत्नानां स्थानभिन्नानां सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति। एवमपि

प्रयत्नः अविशेषितो भवति। आस्येनेत्यर्थः। तथा च बाह्यप्रयत्ना न ह्यापिता भवन्ति।

[२.४] प्रयत्नश्च विशेषितः .... प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य प्रयत्नः। एतद् भाष्यकारस्य दर्शनम् — स्पृष्टतादयः पूर्वम्, उत्तरकालं मूर्ध्नि प्रतिहतस्य वायोर्विवारादय इति।

प्रश्लिष्टावर्णावेतौ। यथैव चोदकुम्भे क्षीरबिन्दुः संश्लिष्टो न ज्ञायते, एवमेव अवर्णम्। अन्ये वर्णयन्ति — प्रश्लिष्टावर्णावेतावित्येतदुक्तं भवति संवृतावर्णाविति।

अवर्णस्य तर्हि ऐचोश्चेति। अयमभिप्रायो — विश्लिष्टावर्णावेताविति। तत्र नाव्यं नौभूतं नौयतीति लोप ईत्वं च स्याताम्।

एतयोरेव तर्हि मिथः। ऐकारौकारयोः। किं पुनः स्यात्? 'एत ऐ' (पा. ३. ४. ९३) इत्यत्रौकारोऽपि प्राप्नोति। यदि तन्नास्ति 'भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं न' इति।

अभेदका उदात्तादय इति। प्रतिपादितं लिङ्गात्, न शास्त्रे एते भेदेन व्याप्रियन्ते इति।

[२.५] यत्समानं तदाश्रयिष्यामः। प्रथमद्वितीययोस्तृतीयचतुर्थयोश्च यद्यपि प्रयत्नभेदस्तथापि यस्तेषां समानो यत्नस्तदाश्रिता सवर्णसंज्ञा प्रवर्तिष्यते।

किं सति भेदे? अयमभिप्रायः — यदि विवारादीनां भेदे स्पृष्टतादिसाम्ये प्रवर्तते, एवं [स्पृ]ष्टतादिभेदे विवारादीनां साम्येऽपि प्राप्नोति। यदि हि यत्र सर्वं समानमिति। एतावद् ब्रूयात् 'अकः अकि दीर्घः' इति, 'झरो झरि' इति। क्रियमाणेऽपि सवर्णग्रहणे सर्वं समानं न भवतीति नैव लोपः स्यात् शिण्ढि, पिण्ढि, इत्यत आह — सति भेदे सवर्णसंज्ञया भवितव्यम् इति। शकारछकारयोः षकारठकारयोः सकारथकारयोश्च। सर्वं समानमघोषत्वं महाप्राणत्वं च। करणं तु भिन्नम्। एके स्पृष्टकरणा अपरे विवृतकरणाः। सत्यां च सवर्णसंज्ञायां निश्श्छद्म, निष्ष्ठुरम्, निस्स्थानम् इति 'झरो झरि सवर्णे' (पा. ८. ४. ६५) इति लोपः प्राप्नोति।

[२.६] एवं तर्हि त्रिपदोऽयं बहुव्रीहिः, तुल्य आस्ये प्रयत्न एषामिति। अभिधानाच्चासमानाधिकरणानामपि बहुव्रीहिरभ्युपगतः। ननु चैवमास्यं तुल्यत्वेनाविशेषितं भवति, विविभक्तित्वात् अप्रधानत्वाच्च। नैष दोषः। यदाधेयं प्रति यदधिकरणमुपादीयते तदाधेयतुल्यतयैव तुल्यमिति विज्ञायते। यथा देवदत्तयज्ञदत्तयोर्मधुरायां

तुल्यं भोजनमित्युक्ते गम्यते एतत्, मधुरापि तयोस्तुल्येति। एवमिहापि ययोर्वर्णयोरास्ये तुल्यः प्रयत्नो भवति, आस्यमपि तयोस्तुल्यमिति। आस्यशब्दस्य तद्धिता(न्तस्या)श्रयणसामर्थ्यात् वा।

अथ वा, पूर्वस्तत्पुरुषस्ततो बहुव्रीहिः। केन लक्षणेन तत्पुरुषः? यदि निपातनात्, समासः स्यात्, न तुल्यत(? न तु त)त्पुरुषः। तस्मात् 'सप्तमी' (पा. २. १. ४०) इति योगविभागात् तत्पुरुषः। निपातनादपूर्वनिपातः। अथ वार्थप्रदर्शनमेतत् — **तुल्य आस्य इति।** साहचर्यादास्ये भवः प्रतिलब्धास्यव्यपदेशः [प्रयत्नः]; प्रथमान्त एव समस्यते — तुल्य आस्य इति, 'कृत्यतुल्याख्या अजात्या' (पा. २. १. ६८) इति।

[३] तस्य। तस्येति [तु] वक्तव्यम्। अर्थप्रदर्शनमेतत्, न तु पाठः। पाठस्तु तथाभूतः कर्तव्यो यथायमर्थो लभ्यते इति। तत्र विस्पष्टमेव वक्तव्यम् यत् 'तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं यद्यस्य तत्तस्य सवर्णम्' इति। अथ वैतद् वक्तव्यम्, 'तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं तत्तस्य सवर्णम्' इति। सामर्थ्याद् गम्यते 'यस्य यद्' इति। इतरथा हि तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वात् सवर्णमित्यस्मिन् नामधेये लब्धे प्रदेशेषु 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इतीदं नास्ति — यो यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नस्तस्य तस्मिन्, इति सवर्णमात्रे दीर्घः प्रवर्तते। सूत्रारम्भः किमर्थ इति चेत्, रेफोष्मणां निवृत्त्यर्थः। 'रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति' (म. भा. १. २८. १२) इति नास्त्येषां तुल्य[स्थान]प्रयत्नता। तत्र रेफे ऊष्मसु च सवर्णसंज्ञाकार्यं मा भूदिति।

[३.१] तस्यावचनमिति। असमासोऽयम्। यः शब्दो भवतोच्चारितस्तस्यावचनमिति। अथ वानुकरणशब्दस् 'तस्य' इति। एतस्यावचनमिति। कुतः? **वचनप्रामाण्यात्** (वा. ३)। ननु चोक्तम्, रेफोष्मणां निवृत्त्यर्थमिति। तच्चास[त्]। तेऽपि हि परस्परेण तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नाः, रेफो रेफान्तरेण, ऊष्मा चोष्मान्तरेण। अथ वा, यद्येतावत् प्रयोजनं स्यात् सवर्णप्रदेशेष्वेव रेफोष्मणां निवृत्तिं कुर्यात्।

[३.२] संबन्धिशब्दैर्वा तुल्यम् (वा. ४)। **मातरि वर्तितव्यं पितरि शुश्रू[षि]तव्यमिति।** मातृशब्दः पितृशब्दश्च लोके न वन्ध्यानिवृत्त्यर्थं नपुंसकनिवृत्त्यर्थं वा प्रयुज्यते। किं तर्हि? अयमेवास्य स्वभावो यदपेक्षितस्वप्रजनन एव प्रवर्तते। या यस्य माता यो यस्य पितेति। एवं तुल्यशब्दो लोके एवंभूत एव। तुल्याय कन्या दातव्येति न चण्डालेन तुल्याय ब्राह्मणः कन्यां ददाति। किं तर्हि? आत्मना। सवर्णे

दीर्घो भवतीति, तुल्यास्यप्रयत्ने अचि अको दीर्घो भवतीत्येतदुक्तं भवति। एवं च सति तुल्यशब्दस्यैवंस्वभावत्वात् अन्तरेण तस्येति वचनमयमेवार्थो लभ्यत इति।

[४] ऋकारलृकारयोः सवर्णविधिः (वा. ५) सवर्णाश्रयस्य कार्यस्य विधिः। अथ वा, संज्ञा विधेया, तत्र संज्ञाविधिर्लघीयानिति। तस्मात् संज्ञा विधेयेत्याह। अथात्र कथमसंबन्धिशब्दत्वे एतयोः सवर्णसंज्ञेत्येतद् गम्यते। न पुनरेतयोरन्यैः सहेति? तत्र मिथ इति वा वक्तव्यम्। अथ वा नायं पाठः कर्तव्यः — ऋकारलृकारयोः सवर्णविधिरिति। किं तर्हि? प्रदर्शनमिति। स तु पाठः कर्तव्यो यथैव तयोरेव मिथः सवर्णसंज्ञा भवति।

होतृलृकारः होतॄकारः इति सवर्णदीर्घत्वं यथा स्यात्। होतुः लृकारः शोभन इति संबन्धषष्ठी। ततश्च समासोऽयमिति। नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनमिति। वक्ष्यत्येतत् सवर्णदीर्घत्वे इति। एवं मन्यते — दीर्घ इति तत्र वर्तते। [ते]न ऋ इति, लृ इति च विभाषिते लृशब्दे दीर्घत्वं भविष्यति। लृति लृवर्णस्य दीर्घा न सन्ति, उभयानुग्राही च दीर्घो नास्तीति ॠकार एव संभविष्यति इति।

तत् सवर्णे यथा स्यात्। यदि सवर्णसंज्ञा[म]विधाय तदुच्यते, अकः लृ इति भवतीति, अङ्मात्रस्य स्यात्। दध्य्लृकारः मध्व्लृकारः इति। तस्माद्विधातव्या सवर्णसंज्ञा। यदेतत् ऋ.... ऋतीति, एतद् ऋत इति वक्ष्यामि। ऋतः सवर्णे (ॠ)ऋ वा भवतीति ऋत्येव भवितव्यम्। तत लृतीति। इदमसवर्णार्थमारभ्यते। ते[न] ऋकारे त्रीणि रूपाणि — एकमसंहिताविषयं, द्वे संहिताविषये। एवं लृकारेऽपि।

तन्न वक्तव्यं भवति। एवं मन्यते — द्वावप्येतौ दीर्घौ, (ॠ)ऋकार (ॢ)लृकारश्च, तौ भविष्यतः। ऋकारे च सवर्णः, लृकारे च सवर्णसंज्ञायां सत्यां ॠकारश्च (ॢ)लृकारश्चेति।

अवश्यं तद्वक्तव्यम्। ऊकालोऽज्झ्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतः (पा. १. २. २७), न चायमजिति। कथमनच्त्वम्? केचिन्मन्यन्ते — द्वौ रेफावर्धाव[थ] चाङ्मात्रेति। ते ईषत्स्पृष्टकरणत्वात् प्रयत्नभेदं मन्यन्ते। अपरे वर्णयन्ति। द्वौ रेफौ तुरीयाव[थ] चाङ्मात्रेति। केचिन्मन्यन्ते — सकलश्च रेफः ऋकारश्चाजभक्तिश्चार्धमात्रेति। किं तु संवृततरोऽयम्। ऋकारश्च विवृतः। प्रयत्नभेदात् नास्यस्य ऋकारे[ण] ग्रहणमिति। एवं तर्हि

अच्त्वं वक्ष्यामि। सत्यच्त्वे दीर्घसंज्ञा लभ्यते। यस्य तु पक्षोऽर्धतृतीयमात्रोऽयमिति तस्याच्त्वे सति दीर्घसंज्ञाया अभावः, भिन्नकालत्वात्। तस्माद् द्विमात्र एवायमभ्युपगन्तव्यः। तत्रावश्यं वक्तव्यम् त्वयापि ऋवावचनं ब्रुवता। कथम्? वचनादिदं तावत् स्यात्। अस्य तु प्लुतोऽशक्यः कर्तुम्। अनयोर्हि प्लुत उच्यते (? इष्यते)। यश्चासौ क्रियतेऽसावप्यनच्त्वात् प्लुतो न भवतीति न स्थानी नाप्यादेश इति स्थितमेतत्—यश्च सवर्णसंज्ञामारभते यश्च सवर्णदीर्घत्वे ऌवावचनं करोति, उभाभ्यामच्त्वं वक्तव्यमिति।

किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः? किं सवर्णसंज्ञाविधानम् उत ऌवावचनमिति? अत्र चोद्यते—यदि लक्षणयोर्लक्ष्ये समानो व्यापार[स्] तत् एतदुपपद्यते—'किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः?' इति। अयमिह तु भिन्न एव व्यापारः। कथम्? यदि सवर्णसंज्ञा विधीयते, न तदुच्यते ऋति ऋवावचनमिति, होतृ ऋकार इति स्थिते द्वयोर्दीर्घयोरुपस्थितयोर्यदि तावत् द्वावपि ऋकारौ स्थानिनौ द्वाभ्यां रेफाभ्यां तद्वन्ताविति इति द्वयो रेफयोर्द्विरेफेणादेशेन भवितव्यमिति—सर्वकालं द्विरेफको दीर्घः प्राप्नोति। अथायं पक्षः—संवृततरमपि(? °मिति), एवमपि विवृतयोः ऋकारयोः स्थाने कथं संवृततरो भविष्यति? तेन सर्वकालं विवृतेन भवितव्यम्। तथा ऌकारे परभूते रलवान् नास्ति दीर्घ इति पर्यायेण कदाचित् [ॠ इति] दीर्घः स्यात्, कदाचित् (ऌ)ऌ इति दोषः (? दीर्घः)। अथ मन्यसे रूपत्रयं साध्यम्, तच्चैवं सिध्यतीति। तच्च न। भिन्नविषयौ ऋकारऌकारौ परिगृह्य त्रैशब्द्यं सिध्येत्, न त्वन्यत् तस्मात्। यस्तु (ऌ)ऌ विधत्ते, तस्य कथम्? असौ (ऌ)ऌ वा वि[द]धत् पक्षे दीर्घत्वं विदधात्येव, (ऌ)ऌ इत्यपि।

ननु च तस्यापि स[व]र्णसंज्ञां विदधतः ऋ ऋतीति ऌकारः स्यात् [सं]निहितः, [ऌ]तीति ऋकारः। तत्र एकैकस्मिंस्त्रैरूप्यं प्राप्नोति। स्यादेतत्। प्रविभागोपादानमनर्थकम् ऋति ऌति चेति। अन्यतरस्मिन् प्रविभागोपादानसामर्थ्यात् त्रैरूप्यं मा भूदिति। अन्यतरस्मि[न्] तत् प्राप्नोति एव।

ऌकारस्य लपरत्वं वक्ष्यामि। व्याख्यास्यामीत्यर्थः। कथम्? प्रत्याहारे 'रट्। लण्।' इति लकारे योऽकारः असावनुनासिकः प्रतिज्ञास्यते। अतस्तेनानेतरदिति(? °स्तेनान्त्येनेता सहितो?) रेफ आदिस्तन्मध्य[स्थ]स्य संज्ञा भविष्यति इति, 'उरण् रपरः' (पा. १. १. ५१) इति रेफस्तन्मध्य[स्थं] लकारं प्रत्याययति। एवमप्युभयोः रलौ कस्मान्न भवतः? आन्तरतम्यात्। यथा जश्भाविनां जशः चर्भाविनां चरः एवं रेफवतो रेफवानादेशः, लकारवतो लकारवांश्च इति।

[प्रक्लृप्यमानमिति]। यथैवं कल्प्यमानमिति णत्वं भवति एवं 'प्रक्लृप्यमानं पश्य' इति 'कृत्यचः' (पा. ८. ४. २९) इति णत्वं प्राप्नोति।

त्रिभिश्च मध्यमैरिति। कोऽत्र विशेषः ? पूर्वत्र शर्व्यवाय इति सामर्थ्यात् षकारोऽनुमीयते, तस्य णत्वे निमित्तत्वात्। इह लशसैश्च इति व्यवधानकरावेव शसावुपादीयेते। ननु लकारव्यवाय इत्यप्युच्यमाने न प्राप्नोति। प्रक्लृप्यमानमिति लकारोऽयं न भवति इति, तत आह—**वर्णैकदेशाश्च वर्णग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते** इति। समुदायव्यापारे अवयवोऽपि व्याप्रियते, न तस्य व्यापार उच्छिद्यत इति। **यद्येवं नार्थो [रषाभ्यां] णत्वे ऋकारग्रहणेन**। रेफादेव णत्वं भविष्यति। एवं च सति नास्ति ऋकारग्रहणमित्यगृह्यमाणं कथं लकारं ग्रहीष्यति इति स्थिता सवर्णसंज्ञा।

एवं सत्यक्षरस[मा]म्नाये ऽनर्थक लकारोपदेश इति। ऋदिति तर्हि यदुच्यते तत् लृदिति अत्रापि प्राप्नोति।* .... न भविष्यति ....। अङर्थं तु लृदित्त्वं स्यात्। तस्मात् लकारः प्रत्याहारे पठितव्यः। पठ्यमाने तस्मिन् पृथगनुबन्धकरणसामर्थ्याद् भवति परिहारः।

नाज्झलौ ॥ १. १. १० ॥

[१] इकारशकारयो[ः] अवर्णहकारयोश्च स्थानकरणे तुल्ये इति प्रतिषेध आरभ्यते सवर्णसंज्ञायाः, 'अज्झलौ मिथः सवर्णसंज्ञौ [न] भवतः' इति। एवमवस्थित इदमुच्यते —

अज्झलोः प्रतिषे(धे शकारप्रतिषे)धोऽज्झल्त्वात् (वा. १)। अज्झलावच्त्वात् [हल्त्वा]च्चाशक्यौ प्रतिषेद्धुमिति प्राकरणिको धर्मः प्रतिषेध्यत्वेन विज्ञायते। कश्चासौ धर्मः ? सवर्णसंज्ञा। अथ वा प्रतिषेधेन निवृत्तिः व्यपदिश्यते। अज्झलोः सवर्णसंज्ञातो निवृत्तौ। शकारप्रतिषेध इति च द्वेधा वर्ण्यते। शकारस्य प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति। तदर्थो यत्नः कर्तव्यः इति। अथ वा योऽयमज्झलो[ः] प्रतिषेधः, अत्र शकारप्रति[षेधः]। यद्यप्येकवचनान्तस्य समासस्तथापि सामर्थ्यात् सविशेषः प्रतीयते, भेदाधिष्ठानत्वात् सवर्णसंज्ञायाः।

अच्चैव हि शकारो हल् च। पाठात् निर्ज्ञातमेवास्य हल्त्वम्, अच्त्वमेवास्य दुरुपपादमित्यच्त्वमेव पृच्छति – **कथं तावदच्त्वमिति**। इतरोऽच्त्वमुपपादयति —

---

* For our tentative filling of this gap, see Notes.

इकारः सवर्णग्रहणेन शकारमपि गृह्णाति। सवर्णगृहीत्या सवर्णग्रहणेन, यद्वा शास्त्रेण। तत्र यथैव इकारोऽच्कार्याणि प्रतिपद्यते, एवं शकारोऽपीति। एवं तावदच्त्वम्।

[१.१] कथं पुनः इकारः शकारं गृह्णाति? यावता नाज्झलावित्ययमस्ति प्रतिषेधः।

[१.१.१] उच्यते—अस्मिन् प्रतिषेधसूत्रे योऽयमवयवोऽजिति स किं गृहीतसवर्णकानामथ नेति विचारयामः। तत्रेदं युक्तं, गृहीतसवर्णकानामिति, यथा 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इत्यस्मिन् ग्रहणे। इह तु नास्ति ग्रहणम् 'अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः' (पा. १. १. ६९) इति। किं कारणम्? अस्मिन् ग्रहणे अपरिनिष्पन्नत्वात् संज्ञासंज्ञिसंबन्धस्य। ग्रहणात् ग्रहणम्। ग्रहणाभावे (? सावर्ण्यात् ग्रहणम्। सावर्ण्याभावे ग्रहणाभावः,) ग्रहणकशास्त्रस्यानभिनिर्वृत्तत्वात्, ग्रहणान्तरस्य चाभावात्, स्वात्मनि च क्रियाविरोधात्। तत्र ह्यणग्रहणे(? ह्यज्ग्र°) ग्रह[ण]कशास्त्रमनभिनिर्वृत्तं, क्रियमाणत्वात् संज्ञासंज्ञिसंबन्धस्य। ग्रहणान्तरं च नास्ति। स्वात्मनि च क्रिया विरुध्यते। यथा घटो नात्मानं शक्नोति स्प्रष्टुम्। एवं च कृत्वा 'हलन्त्यम्' (पा. १. ३. ३) इत्यत्रोक्तम् — 'लकारस्यानुबन्धत्वाज्ञापितत्वात् हल्ग्रहणाप्रसिद्धिः (पा. १. ३. ३, वा. ३) इति। अस्मिन् हि हल् इति व्यपदेशे स्वात्मनि क्रिया विरुध्यत इति न शक्नोति लकारस्येत्संज्ञां प्रतिपादयितुम्। तस्मात् पृथक् लकारस्येत्संज्ञा वक्तव्येति। तत्र चोक्तम् — 'सिद्धं तु लकारनिर्देशात्' (पा. १. ३. ३, वा. ४) 'एकशेषनिर्देशाद्वा' (पा. १. ३. ३, वा. ५) इति।

[१.१.२] यथैव चाण्ग्रहणे (? चाज्ग्र°) ग्रहणं नास्ति, एवं प्रतिषेधग्रहणे प्रतिषेधाभावः, प्रतिषेधशास्त्रस्यानभिनिर्वृत्तत्वात्, प्रतिषेधशास्त्रस्यैव [शास्त्रान्तरस्या-]भावात्। स्वात्मनि च क्रियाविरोधात्। नाज्झलाविति प्रतिषेधोऽनभिनिर्वृत्त एवास्मिन्नजिति प्रत्याहारे। शास्त्रान्तरं च नास्ति प्रतिषेधकम्। स्वात्मनि च क्रिया विरुध्यते, घटस्पर्शवत्। तत्र यथैव मा शब्दं कार्षीरिति नानेनास्यैव शब्दस्य प्रतिषेधः शक्यः कर्तुम्। किं तर्हि? शब्दान्तराणाम्। एवमिह प्रतिषेधसूत्रे अशक्यः प्रतिषेधः कर्तुमिति। यथैव च [? न] इकारशकारयोः सवर्णसंज्ञा प्रतिषिध्यते, एवं शकारयोरपीति। यथैव 'कुमारी शेते' इति नास्ति सवर्णसंज्ञा[प्रतिषेध] [ई]कारस्य शकारे परत इति।

[१.२] ननु च 'प्रकल्प्य वापवाद[विषय]मुत्सर्गः प्रवर्तते' इति स[व]र्णसंज्ञा प्रतिषेधविषयमुत्सृज्याभिनिविष्टेति कुतो ग्रहणम्? सत्यम्, एवमेतत्, यद्यत्रापवादः

स्यात्। स च नास्ति इत्युक्तम्, अनिष्पन्नत्वात् प्रतिषेधस्येति। न चेदत्रापवादविषयोऽस्तीति, प्रवर्तितव्यं सवर्णसंज्ञया, तत्पूर्वकेण च तद्ग्रहणेनेति इह प्रत्याहारे शकारस्याच्त्वेन ग्रहणादन्यत्र नास्ति सवर्णत्वेन ग्रहणमिति इदमाह — **तत्र सवर्णलोपे दोषः** इति। विषयवन्तं दोषमाचष्टे, सवर्णलोपविषये सवर्णलोपाप्राप्तिर्दोषः।

परश्शतानि कार्याणीति। शतादतिक्रान्तानि शतादधिकानि कर्तव्यानि इति। 'पञ्चमी' (पा. २. १. ३७) इति योगविभागात् समासः। 'साधनं कृता' (पा. २. १. ३३, वा. २) इति वा। राजदन्तादित्वात् (पा. २. २. ३१) परनिपातः। परशब्देन समासः। परार्थो वा परस्-शब्दः, पारस्करादित्वाद् (पा. ६. १. १५७) वा सुट् द्रष्टव्यः। तत्र सकारस्य श्चुत्वे कृते, द्विर्वचने, सावर्ण्यस्य प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् त्रिशकारः स्यादिति दोषः।

[१.३] अ[त्र] चोदयन्ति। शकारश्चेदजिति इकारेण गृहीतः, स यथैवाच्कार्यं प्रतिषेधं लभते, एवमिदमपि कस्मात् [न] प्रतिपद्यते 'शरोऽचि' (पा. ८. ४. ४९) न द्वे भवत इति, 'अनचि च' (पा. ८. ४. ४७) द्वे भवत इति? न चात्र तेन द्विर्वचनमपि न भविष्यति? त एवं परिहारमाहुः — 'अनचि च' इति पर्युदासोऽयम्, अचोऽन्यस्मिन्निति। भवति चायमचोऽन्य इति।

एतदसत्। न ह्येतत् संज्ञासु प्रतिपादयितुं शक्यम्। इह शकारो हल् चाच्। तत् यदि एवमुच्येत — अचोऽन्यस्मिन् भवितव्यमिति, शकारो वर्ज्येत न वर्ज्येत इति, निःसंशयं न वर्ज्येतैकार्थचोदनायामपि यस्मिन्नर्थे प्रतिपद्यते। 'अप्रासादवासिन आनीयन्ताम्' इति किमु[भय]वासिनो भूमिवासित्वाद् भवितव्यमानयनेनाहोस्वित् प्रासादवासित्वादशक्योऽसौ प्रासादवासिनोऽन्य इति व्यपदेष्टुमिति न भ[वि]तव्यमानयनेनेति? एवं शबलः छागः, किमकृष्णमालभेत शु(? ताशु)शुक्लमालभेतेत्यालब्धव्यो नालब्धव्यः इति। नालब्धव्यः।

एवं तु त्रिशकारत्वमिह न्यायप्राप्तमेव। कथम्? उक्तं हि 'प्रतिषेधसूत्रे प्रतिषेधो नास्ति अनभिनिर्वृत्तत्वात् प्रतिषेधस्यास्य, [अ]न्यत्र तु प्रत्याहारेऽस्त्येव प्रतिषेधः' इति कुतोऽस्य द्विर्वचनविधावच्त्वम्? तस्मादस्य स यत्नः कर्तव्यो येन इकार इह प्रत्याहारे शकारं न गृह्णाति। ग्रहणे हि सति व्यक्तमन्यत्र ग्रहणमस्ति शकारस्य। एतच्च प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधोऽयमिति कृत्वोपन्यस्तम्। एवं च कृत्वा वाक्यं पठितम् — **अज्झलोः प्रतिषेध इति**। प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधं प्रतिषेध इति आह। यदि पर्युदासः स्यात् 'तुल्यास्य-

प्रयत्नं सवर्णं, नाज्झलौ' इति नैव किंचिल्लक्षणं विधायकमज्झलोरस्ति नापि प्रतिषेधकमिति, अज्झलौ मिथो मुक्त्वा अचां हलां च मिथः सवर्णसंज्ञेति दोषाभावः।

[२] सिद्धमनच्त्वात् (वा. ३)। आस्यान्तर्वर्तिनः प्रयत्नस्य भेदात् सावर्ण्यं नास्ति। असति तस्मिन् किं प्रतिषेधेनेति सूत्रप्रत्याख्यानेन परिहार उक्तः। यथा तु पाणिनीयैः पठितम्, उभयत्र वा ईषत् इति अनुवर्तते, उभयत्र वा निवृत्तमिति। तथा परिहारमाह —

[२.१] वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेर्वा (वा. ४)। नास्ति ग्रहणम् इति। इदं वाक्यम् अपरिसमाप्तार्थत्वात् 'अणुदित् सवर्णस्य च' (पा. १. १. ६९) इत्यपरिसमाप्तमित्युच्यते। कथं पुनरस्यापरिसमाप्तत्वम् ? अङ्गयोरनिर्ज्ञानात्। वाक्यस्य इमे अङ्गे, अणिति च सवर्णस्येति च। ते यदा निर्ज्ञाते भवतः 'अयमण् अयं सवर्णः' इति, तदा ग्रहणम्। तत्र उपदेश, इत्संज्ञा, प्रत्याहार इत्येतेष्वस्य ग्रहणं प्रति नास्ति व्यापारः। यत्रैव तावत् अणिति रूपमुच्चरितम्, 'अणुदित्सवर्णस्य' इति, तत्रैव तावत् [न] ग्रहणम्। किमङ्ग पुनर्यत्रैतदुपायानि रूपाणि इति ? उपदेशकालेऽसवर्णा ह्यते।

प्रत्याहारोत्तरकाला च सवर्णसंज्ञेति। ना[त्र] पाठक्रमोऽभिप्रेतः। किं तर्हि ? प्रवृत्तिक्रमः, 'अणुदित्सवर्णस्य च' (पा. १. १. ६९) इत्यस्मिन् यः क्रमोऽणिति च सवर्णस्येति च। तत्र यथैवोपदेशादिष्वनिर्वृत्तं रूपमिति नास्ति ग्रहणमेवं सवर्णेऽप्यनिर्ज्ञाते न ग्रहणेन प्रवर्तितव्यम्। यदा सोत्सर्गा सापवादा सवर्णसंज्ञा निर्ज्ञाता भवति, तदा चान्यत्राप्यच्त्वव्यपदेशेषु सवर्णत्वेन ग्राहकं भविष्यति इति नैवात्र ग्रहणं, न प्रतिषेधः। अत्र च नेकारो गृहीतो नापि शकार इति ईकारशकारयोः [न] प्रतिषिद्धा सवर्णसंज्ञा। ईकारशकारयोस्तुल्यत्वात् सावर्ण्यमिति 'कुमारी शेते' इति सावर्ण्यकार्यमेकादेशः प्राप्नोति। अजधिकारान्निवर्त्यते।

[२.२] यथैव तर्हि [इकारः] शकारं न गृह्णाति, एवमीकारमपि न गृह्णीयात्। एवं मन्यते। यत्र यत्र सवर्णसंशब्दनं तत्र तत्र चक्रकं वर्तत इति। वर्णानामुपदेशादिष्वेव नास्ति ग्रहणम्। ते हि एतदर्था उपादीयन्ते। यथा कपालावस्थायां घट एव नास्ति, कुतस्तस्य कार्यविशे[ष]ः ? ये तु प्रदेशाः 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' (पा. ६. १. १०१) इति, न ते एतदर्थाः, इदमेव तदर्थमिति किमिति ग्रहणं न भविष्यति ? अतोऽनेनोपायेनैतत् कथयति, इह विषये ग्रहणमिहाग्रहणमिति।

[२.३] अपर आह । सर्वमेतत् समानम् । एतावांस्तु विशेषः । सिद्धेरनच्त्वं हेतुः, अनच्त्वस्य वाक्यापरिसमाप्तिः । अत्र तु साध्यस्य भिन्नत्वात् हेतुविकल्पो न युज्यते इत्याह —

अस्मिन् पक्षे वेत्येतदसमर्थितं भवति । एतच्च समर्थितम् । वाक्यशेष उपादास्यते प्रतिज्ञाविकल्पार्थमित्यभिप्रायः । वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेरनच्त्वाद्वा सिद्धम्, यदि वा ग्रहणमिकारेण शकारस्येति । **ननु च भेदो भवति ।** अभ्युपगम्य श्रुतिकृतं भेदमिदमुच्यते ।

विभाषा द्विर्वचनम् । 'यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा' (पा. ८. ४. ४५) इति वर्तते । **स एष कथं भेदो न स्यात् ।** अस्त्येव भेदः इत्यर्थः । **इतर आह — यदि नित्यो लोपः स्यात् ।** स्याद् भेदः ।

किं तु विभाषा [स] लोपः । 'झयो होऽन्यतरस्याम्' (पा. ८. ४. ६२) इति वर्तते । एवं चेत् यथाभेद आवयोस्तथा शास्त्रमवस्थितम् । अपरेषां व्याख्यानम् —

स एष कथं भेदो न इति एतावति स्थिते पक्षे **इतर आह —**

स्यात् यदि नित्यो लोपः [स्यात्] । स्यादेव भेदो यदि नित्यो लोपः स्यादिति ।

इति भर्तृहरिटीकायां चतुर्थमाह्निकम् ॥

TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION

" (Guṇa and Vṛddhi are) prohibited before an *ārdhadhātuka* (suffix), which has caused the elision of (a part of) a root " (P. 1. 1. 4).

[1]

A word having a fixed dimension has the name *dhātu*. In the case of its (i. e. of the *dhātu*) elision, there is no possibility of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. (So) what is the good of (their) negation ? Hence, the *Vṛttikāra* explains : *dhātulopa* means elision of a *dhātu*. (In other words) it means, the *ārdhadhatuka* (*pratyaya*) (which is) the cause (of the elision) of a part of a root.

Another (commentator) says thus :— *Dhātulopa* means the elision of the (whole) root or of a part (of it), (that means) the cause of the elision of a root. Elision of the whole root is also *dhātulopa* ; and elision of a part (of it) is also *dhātulopa*. This is what the form of the word (*śabdavṛtta*) conveys. Here, however, elision of (only) a part (of a root) is (alone) possible and hence it is adopted.

In this manner, this (is what) is stated. Linguistic usage is carried on with the term *dhātu*, which applies when all its parts exist, but not .... This is the observation on the (express) use of the word *dhātu*.

The word *dhātu* expresses the whole root itself. And the elision means the absence of a part only. As for this partial non-existence, it is referred to as being associated with the whole complex. For, an activity pertaining to a part is ascribed to the whole, as for example, (in) *paṭo dagdhaḥ*, *alaṁkṛto Devadattaḥ*, *klinno Devadattaḥ*.

This very meaning has been shown (stated) by the respected *vṛttikāra* (in the words), *dhātulopa* means elision of a part of the root.

[2]

" For what purpose is (the word) *dhātu* included (in this Sūtra) ? " The question is unwarranted, owing to the subordinate position (of the word *dhātu* in this sūtra). That is why some *Vṛttikāras* read (this question as) : why is the word *dhātulopa* used (in this *Sū*. ? Though the *Vṛttikāras* speak of the whole (*dhātu*), only a part of it is (really) called into question. Otherwise, it would be only a child's statement, giving injunction and prohibition with reference to one and the same thing. (Reply :) There is nothing wrong in this,

What possibly may occur on the basis of propriety, (he) states as the expected one.

lūñ lavitā. But the counter-example given in the *Vṛtti* is not plausible because of the statement prohibiting (*guṇa* and *vṛddhi*) before the *ārdhadhātuka* (suffix), (which is) the cause of the elision of the root. What is meant is this: If the word *dhātu* is included (in the *Sū.*), *bahuvrīhi* becomes possible; and if it is *bahuvrīhi*, it can be an adjunct to both.

[2. 1]

But how is it that elision of the code-letters cannot amount to the elision of the root? We reply: Here the two names, namely *dhātu* and *it*, operate simultaneously. But that, which has the designation *it* does not exist. Such is the axiom of Grammar. And this being so, the term *dhātu* applies (to a word) in the same stage of derivation in which the term *it* applies to it. But when the term *dhātu* becomes applicable, at that time the code-letter surely does not exist. And what does not exist cannot have the designation *dhātu*. If, on the other hand, the term *dhātu* is (supposed to apply) first, even then it (can apply) only to (the forms) having the sense of activity. And the meaning of a word used in language is assigned to a part of it on the basis of abstraction through positive and negative concomitance. But a code-letter has neither positive nor negative concomitance; and the term *dhātu* applies only to that much portion of a group of letters which is amenable to positive and negative concomitance, after assuming for it some meaning comprising an act. So, three is nothing wrong here. Even in *tiṣṭhāsati* and such other forms, capacity to express an act is found to belong even to a word (like *tiṣṭhāsati*) together with (the letter) *s*.

[2. 2]

vṛṣabho roravīti 'The bull roars repeatedly'. If the word *ārdhadhātuka* is included (in the *Sū.*), since the meaning of word other than the consti, tuents is expressed in so many words, a clear *bahuvrīhi* is understood. Hence, the use of the word *ārdhadhātuka* (is this *Sū.*). It is for this same purpose that even the *Bhāṣyakāra* has put forth these counter-examples, thinking: I shall, in due course, reject this *sūtra*; and shall state that, from one point of view, the inclusion of the word *dhātu* (in this *Sū.*) is futile.

[2. 3]

Here are four possible alternative views, out of which two have been set forth here (in the *Mbh.*) viz.: (i) the word *ārdhadhātuka* (used here) is a qualifier of elision; (and) (ii) (it is) a qualifier of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*. (The remaining two views not mentioned here in the *Mbh.* are); (iii) it is a qualifier

of both *lopa* and *guṇavṛddhi* without being a *bahu*°, by force of its repetition, like the repetition of *upadeśa* in *ekāca upadeśe 'nudāttāt* (P. 7. 2. 10), and (iv) (taking *dhātulopa* as) a *bahuvrīhi*.

[3]

"But what is [the purpose of] this inclusion of [the word] *ārdhadhātuka* (in this *Sū.*)?" Is the elision depending upon (= caused by) an *ārdhadhātuka* mentioned as indicative of the absence of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*? Or is it that the elision caused even by any other factor mentioned as indicative of the absence of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* caused by an *ārdhadhātuka*? — Which of these (views) is reasonable? The answer is: both. How? Becauee, both *lopa* and *guṇa* are subsidiary to negation. Both these, *guṇa* and *lopa*, are subsidiary to negation. Such being the case, the word *ārdhadhātuka* can be associated with both (*lopa* and *guṇa*). Hence the question.

(If it is an adjunct to *lopa*, this *sūtra*) will operate in the formation of *upeddha* and *preddha* (and prevent the *guṇa*). (Objection:) But (the *guṇa* taught by '*ād guṇaḥ*'), being internal, takes place before (the suffix *ta*), for, a verbal root is first combined with the preverb. Hence the (proper) illustration here will be *kaṣṭeddha*. And, (secondly,) if [a verb is first connected with a suffix, how to account for forms like *upe*]*ddhaḥ*, *preddhaḥ*? — There is nothing wrong here for (the *Bhāṣyakāra* himself) is going to declare the concept of an internal and an external operation in the words: 'If connection with a preverb is accepted as taking place first, then *guṇa* will be internal and prohibition, external. On the other hand, if application of a suffix is prior, even then *guṇa* will be external and prohibition, internal (and so no harm). But, this (other) way of removing the difficulty, namely that it is not taught for *ik* as such, is not adopted here because he thinks: 'I am going to state it later on',

(Objection:) (But according to the Pari.) '(There is) no status of external, if there is a contiguity of vowels', (the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari. is applicable) only when there is no knowledge of (what is) correct and (what is) incorrect. — (No.) This is not proper. For the correct and the incorrect is known from Grammar. Others say that (in the case under consideration) when there is bringing in of a letter involved, as in *hiraṇyadyū* 'one who gambles with gold', where a *yaṅ* is produced (only there the Pari. *nājānantarye* can restrain the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari.). But in that case even a prohibition is produced. Hence, what is meant is: this (i. e. the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari.) has no application where immediate sequence of vowels is resorted to in a rule (as positive factor) where an operation is taught. Here in this prohibition, however, it is not resorted to and hence there is no defect.

" (If *ārdhadhātuka* is the adjunct of *guṇa-vṛddhi*, this prohibition will (undesiredly) operate in (the formation) *knopayati* also ". But here because *puk* is *bahiraṅga*, elision of *y* cannot occur. But if the elision (of *y* can be obtained) on the basis of *nipātana*, namely *cele knopeḥ* (P. 3. 4. 33), then (by the same) *nipātana*, *guṇa* also will be there.

" If so, no purpose is served by the inclusion of (the word) *dhātu* (in the *Sū.*) ". Even without a *bahuvrīhi* (the word) *ārdhadhātuka* can be taken as an adjunct to both. (Then the *Sū.* would mean) : *guṇa* and *vṛddhi*, which are caused by an *ārdhadhātuka* and which become due after an elision caused by an *ārdhadhātuka*, do not take place. And the elision of a code-letter is not caused by an *ārdhadhātuka*.

[4]

" A complete enumeration should be made ". This rule should be stated as : ' Prohibition (occurs) when there is elision of *yaṅ*, *yak*, *kya* and *va* '. When this is stated *knopayati* and other (forms) will be obtained. (Only) in the case of the elision of *va* some special feature will have to be observed, so that the prohibition will apply to *jīv*, but not to *sriv*.

[4. 1]

" For avoiding the prohibition after the elision of *num*, (after the elision of *v*) with reference to the root *sriv*, and after the elision of *anubandha* ". Here by *num* a penultimate *n* should be understood. This (viz. *num*) is to be so understood, being a technical term of ancient teachers. Otherwise, (the *lopa* will be understood) as the substitute for *num* and so the desired (meaning) will not be understood. Because of the full enumeration given here, there is no prohibition of *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* in these cases. In the absence of (this) enumeration, prohibition will occur by (the presence of) radical elision.

[4. 2]

" Because of the context of *ikaḥ*, the *vṛddhi* (is not prevented) when there is elision of *num* ". Where the expression *ikaḥ* occurs in order to prevent any other *sthānin* (from undergoing *guṇa-vṛddhi*), there this prohibition (holds good). Here *ikaḥ* has no function.

[4. 3]

" (The goal) in other cases is achieved since (the elision mentioned in this *Sū.*) depends upon an (*ārdhadhātuka*) suffix ". What is meant is that *ārdhadhātuke* qualifies both (i. e. *lopa* and Guṇa-Vṛddhi).

" (The prohibition is) not available in the case of *jīradānu*," for, the elision here is not dependent upon a suffix. What then ? It depends upon a letter, because of the statement *valopaḥ* ' elision of *v* '.

[4. 4]

" Before *rak*, the root *jyā-* undergoes Samprasāraṇa ". There by *kṅiti* (P. 1. 1. 5) negation (of Guṇa) is established. And also *avagraha* is established. Nor is the accent of the word incorrect, because it is a *bahuvrīhi*.

" *Bṛh*. is a different root ". It is a different root because, in the Appendix, it has been read separately, without any difference of opinion. For, it is not subject (restricted) to only five paradigms like the root *āh* (which is only a substitute for *brū* and not an independent full-fledged root).

" (In the absence of enumeration, prohibition of Guṇa) will take place in forms like *bhedyate* and *chedyate* ". Both these (result) in connection with a following *ārdhadhātuka*, since elision of *ṇi* is caused by the *ārdhadhātuka* (*yak*) and when *ṇi*, an *ārdhadhātuka*, follows, Guṇa and Vṛddhi are but imminent. — But this (argument) is not proper, because the Guṇa is effected because of *ṇi*, even before the application of the *vikaraṇa* (*yak*) and the *sārvadhātuka* (*te*).

" (The word *dhātulope*) is not interpreted like this ". What he is stating by this is that it (*dhātulopa*) is a *bahuvrīhi*. Since it is a *bahuvrīhi*, the elision and *guṇa-vṛddhi* must be understood to have a common cause. But here, (in *bhedyate* etc.) the elision (of *ṇi*) takes place because of one *ārdhadhātuka* suffix (viz. *yak*), while *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* take place because of another (viz. *ṇic*). Thus, there is no prohibition.

[5]

" Where the substitute is for the consonant and the vowel (together) ". In *yaṅo'ci ca* (P. 2. 4. 74) the combined form *ya* is designated as suffix ; and its elision is possible by (the injunction of) *luk*. " Even here after the phoneme *a* is elided (there is scope for *sthānivadbhāva*) ". What is meant is this : After the phoneme *a* is elided, the (mere) *y* (that remains) does have the name *pratyaya* (suffix). Just as in *apacat*, even after the elision of a part (namely *i*), what remains (namely *t*) does have the name *pratyaya*. Nor (can you say) that in *yaṅo 'ci*, the combination (*ya*) (i. e. *y*) together with the phoneme *a* is meant to be expressed ; just as when the word *gauḥ* is used in a generic capacity, the colour etc. (of the bull) are not intended to be included, and hence, (the bull,) whether possessed of a particular quality or not, is (called by the name) ' bull '. So here also, whether *a* is there or not, (*y* or *ya*) is (called) *yaṅ*.

"When the *luk*-elision is effected there is no scope (for *sthānivadbhāva*). " The idea that the *luk*-elision is obligatory will be expressed later. " This should he decided here ". (By *luk* in the *Mbh.*) is meant the *luk* of what has remained (after *lopa*). The scope for *lopa*-elision is *cikīrṣitā* ; the scope for *luk*-elision is mere *y*. But in the combination (that is $y+a$) both become due. But owing to its being subsequent, the *lopa*-elision of *a* of *ya*(*ṅ*) (takes place).

" *Luk* is obligatory ". *Luk* is obligatory, because the working of the rule is obligatory. But when the whole is elided by *luk*, the *lopa* has no scope at all. Hence its non-obligatoriness.

" Even *luk* is non-obligatory ". He states the non-obligatoriness of *luk* on the assumption of a division in the word (as $y+a$). When the whole *ya* is taken into consideration, if *ato lopaḥ* takes effect, there will be *luk* of (*y*) without the vowel. If, on the other hand, (it takes effect) before (*lopa*) is effected, (there will be) elision of (*y*) together with *a*. Hence, even *luk* is non-obligatory. Such being the case, of the two non-obligatory (rules) *ato lopaḥ* (will take effect) because of its being later.

" Then *luk* will have no scope ". — How do you think it will be without scope ? — Because *luk* starts taking effect when *lopa* is already due. If *luk* is not stated, '*ato lopaḥ*' will operate (and there will be elision of *a*). Or *luk* is laid down for the *pratyaya* (suffix) ; and mere *y* is not *pratyaya*. Why ? Owing to its absence in the usage. And also, because in Grammar there is no teaching of a mere *y* (as the suffix). Thus this (*y*) can be established as *pratyaya* neither by usage nor by Grammar. Moreover, in *yaño' ci ca* (P. 2. 4. 74) the combination (of *y* and *a*) has been (actually) mentioned. Hence, *luk* has no scope.

" *Luk* has scope.—Which (i.e. where has it a) scope ? — (There at) what remains ". This is what he thinks. Different are the provinces of *lopa* and *luk*. Moreover, mere consonant *y* is found to have the nature of *pratyaya* since in *lolūyitā* and such other forms, there is the determination of identity in the form : this (*y*) is the same as that *ya*. Nor (can you say that) in *yaño 'ci ca* the form actually used (i. e. *ya*) is intended to be meant. Therefore what remains (i. e. *y*) affords scope (for *luk*).

" Still, somehow ". This is said on the basis of the idea stated before (i. e. the cluster in *yaṅ* is intended) .

" Even then, we shall resort to the splitting of the rule (to have the elision of *a*) in (the section of) '*ato lopaḥ*' ". — And this splitting of the rule is meant only for preventing *luk*.

" *Luk* based on the same support as *lopa* is set aside by *lopa* ", owing to (their) being simultaneous. On the basis of *bahulaṁ chandasi*, it will surely

do its work without depending on any (other) cause, because of its being internal. (Objection :) But even the rule *ato lopaḥ* is laid down in connection with an *ārdhadhātuka* in general. — Here an *ārdhadhātuka* has been resorted to, and so also the jurisdiction of '*aṅgasya*'. Or, even if (the operation is understood) in a general way, still mental similarity has to be resorted to. In the case of *luk*, however, even this resorting to by mind is not there.

[6]

" In the case of *nikucita* also (the solution) has been stated. Which ? (That which is taught in) a rule (the application of) which is occasioned by the combination) (of two things), does not become the cause of the destruction of that (combination) ". (In *nikucita*) elision of *n* is brought about on account of association (of *n*) with the *kit* character (of the ppl. suffix). That (elision of *n*) cannot be instrumental in effecting the absence of the *kit*-character by *udupadhāt* ... (P. 1. 2. 21). Hence here (in the illustration in question) prohibition laid down by *kṅiti ca* (P. 1. 2. 5) will apply.

[7]

If on the strength of *sthānivadbhāva* (this) rule is rejected, in *jaṅgama* will occur elision of the penultimate. Similarly, in *yāyā*, '*āto lopaḥ* ...' (P. 6. 4. 64) will apply (causing) the elision of *ā* and in *dedya* the augment *yuṭ* will come by *dīṅo yuḍ aci kṅiti* (P. 6. 4. 63). (Objection :) But in *jaṅgama*, there will be prohibition (of the elision of the penultimate) by '*anaṅi*' P. 6. 4. 98. — But how can this be *aṅ*, since here actually *yaṅ* is taught ? And even if it can be (looked upon as *aṅ*) on the disappearance of *y* (from it), even so it is meaningless. Well, how is the negation available here in *agamat* ? Because of its meaningfulness, as it is of the nature of a reference (of the suffix).

Moreover, an operation observed to take place when the original is there, is extended when there is a substitute. But no operation is observed (to take place) when the phoneme *a* is there. Then how can (the operations) proceed when (the phoneme *a*) has been lost ? Such being the case in *yāyāvara* (the rule) *āto lopaḥ* has no scope at all. So what is the use of the negation of *sthānivadbhāva* when *-vara* follows (P. 1. 1. 58) ? On this point, this is Pāṇini's view : just as an operation not observed (as taking place) in thh case of *lakāra* becomes due in the case of (its) substitute, and hence is laid down on the basis of mere possibility, so in this case also. (Moreover,) just as on the loss of phoneme *a*, the mere (consonant) *y* can be a *pratyaya*, similarly here also it is possible to presume that on the elision of *y*, when *a* is present, it will have the status of a *pratyaya* ; that is why in the case of *yāyāvara* has been laid down the negation of *sthānivadbhāva*.

But how are *jaṅgama* etc. to be justified on the view of the *Vārttikakāra*? (Reply :) In his view also there is a *luk*-elision. Hence the (undesired) formations *yāya-* and *dedīya* (instead of *yāyā-* and *dedya-* respectively) will not be there. In *loluv-* and other formations, however, the status of *pratyaya* will be assumed for *a* on the basis of mere possibility, and the *sthānivadbhāva* and the substitute *uvaṅ* which result from it.

* * *

" Guṇa and Vṛddhi are prohibited) also before (a suffix) having a code letter *k* or *ṅ* " (P. 1. 1. 5).

[1]

Both (1) Guṇa and Vṛddhi, and (2) (their) prohibition are here to be inferred, still the prohibition being taught is the principal. And from this word-form it is not clear that the principal has no expectancy for this qualifier, viz. (the expression) *kṅiti*. If there is (such) an expectancy, it is not proper that having bypassed the principal, (*kṅiti*) be a qualifier of Guṇa and Vṛddhi. Therefore, with the locative form viz. *kṅiti*, the prohibition should apply to what immediately (precedes the *kṅit* suffix). It may be said (by the opponent) that the qualifier (*kṅiti*) of Guṇa and Vṛddhi favours both (i. e. the prohibition also), as for example *striyām* (P. 4. 1. 3), which is a qualifier of *prātipadikasya* which is subordinate. — It may be reasonable there, because of the favour for both (which is there), but not here ; so (it is) properly a qualifier of the prohibition. (Objection :) But when (*kṅiti* is taken as) the qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi (the prohibition,) applying to (both) the mediate and the immediate, gets a large scope. It is not so. It is like the *śunaskarṇastoma* sacrifice. Just as on the death of the principal party (i. e. sacrifice) they do not continue the sacrifice for the subordinates, similarly (here) the principal (i. e. the prohibition) may be expectant of the *prakṛti* (i. e. *ik*) standing in a particular domain only ; for this reason also this view (of *ubhayānugraha*) is not reasonable. (Objection :) well, it may be a qualifier of the prohibition, but (mainly it is) a qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi. For everywhere (it is) an activity or process (that) is laid down. Either the substitution of Guṇa and Vṛddhi takes place or it does not.—Even so, (activity) which has assumed the likeness of existence is admitted here, not (the one in the form of) withdrawal. Therefore Guṇa-Vṛddhi is a qualifier of existence, not of (their) withdrawal. — Even then immediacy (of *kṅit*) is not possible with prohibition and so it cannot reasonably be its qualifier. — The same applies to Guṇa-Vṛddhi also. Surely there is no immediacy of Guṇa-Vṛddhi with *kṅit*. Therefore the prohibition qualified by (i. e. pertaining to) Guṇa-Vṛddhi is a perfection of the original, i. e. the *ik*, to which (in this way) a new lease is given. And immediacy is possible with *ik*. So it is said —

[1. 1]

" The reading of *tannimitta* ." This is not the (regular) text. What then ? This is only pointing out the idea. Such being the case such an expression has to be adopted by the commentators in which this idea is contained. Verily it is to be read thus : ' Guṇa and Vṛddhi, which have a suffix with a code-letter *k* or *ṅ* as their cause, do not take place '. The Bhāṣyakāra is of the view that the word *nimitta* ' cause ' which is not there should be read. Others, however, explain that the idea implied by the word *nimitta* is to be brought out. (They thus explain :) The word *kṅiti* is a qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi. When (it is) a qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi there is no presenting itself by this Pari. viz. ' When (a condition) is mentioned in the Locative, (the operation taught) applies to what precedes immediately (P. 1. 1. 66) '. A Paribhāṣā, being a subordinate part of an injunctive rule, presents itself wherever (an operation) is laid down. Just as the Paribhāṣā *iko guṇavṛddhī* (P. 1. 1. 3) presents itself where Guṇa and Vṛddhi are laid down. But where Vṛddhi, being already established, is mentioned for some other purpose, as e. g. in (P. 1. 1. 73 which says :) ' That (word-element) is named Vṛddha, the first of whose vowels is (technically named) Vṛddhi ', — the word *ikaḥ* does not present itself there. If it presents itself, the name Vṛddha will not be there in (words) like *śālīya*. A clue for this is the reading of (the word) *sthāne* in (P. 7. 3. 46 :) *udīcām ātaḥ sthāne ...*, which is meant to ensure that there is no prohibition when it is not caused by connection with place. Similarly, here also Guṇa and Vṛddhi are not laid down (here). The two are elsewhere from where they are laid down when *kṅiti* is adopted. Since, for this reason, the *anantara*-Paribhāṣā does not present itself here, the prohibition (of Guṇa-Vṛddhi substitutes for *ik*) is established both when there is intervention and also immediacy. There Guṇa and Vṛddhi, which are laid down when (a suffix) having *k* or *ṅ* as code-letter follows, they do not take place. There is no admition of any cause in the matter of the prohibition in connection with the *kṅit*. — But this is not reasonable, as the principal position belongs to the prohibition. —(After all) this favour (is) just for what is implied; why then this insistence (of yours) on (taking *kṅiti*) in favour of the prohibition, and not in favour of the rule of Guṇa-Vṛddhi ? (Reply :) This is a place of (the operation of) the Paribhāṣā *tasmin niti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*, so the word *nimitta* has to be read. Further, (*kṅiti*) has to be interpreted as a qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi on the strength of some indication. The principal sometimes imposes properties on the subordinate owing to the peculiar nature of properties — and this imposition is just for helping its own operation — while sometimes it accepts those properties for itself and proceeds towards (its) operation. As for the parallel (from ritual), there the death of the sacrificer is directly heard. Here, on the other hand, there is no (such thing). So a plurality of domains is attributed to (*kṅiti*), the direct qualifier of Guṇa-Vṛddhi.

[2]

" For the sake of the penultimate and for the sake of (the form) *roravīti* ". For the sake of (prohibition of the Guṇa-substitute for *ik* when it is) penultimate (and so) intervened; in the other case (i. e. *roravīti*) for ensuring that there is no prohibition caused by *yaṅ*. " Only where (*ik*,) the potential original for the Guṇa-substitute, is immediately close to the following *kit* or *ṅit* suffix ". This is said for the reason that there is no immediacy...

Just as in the case of (P. 6. 1. 77 :) *iko yaṇ aci*, immediacy of *ac* is possible both with *ik* and with *yaṇ*; but in the present case it is so neither with the prohibition nor with Guṇa-Vṛddhi. So immediacy (is possible) with *ik* alone. — He mentions the application of Guṇa; why is no illustration given for Vṛddhi? Here is (one example) viz. *mṛṣṭaḥ*. — This is the idea (behind not illustrating the Vṛddhi): there the original for the Vṛddhi is mentioned — ' Vṛddhi in the place of *mṛj* ', ' in the place of (its) *ac* '.

[2. 1]

" But, that for which the Guṇa [substitution] is taught ... ". But how is it possible to resort here to (the stem [*aṅga*]) ending in *puk*, or having a light penultimate when it is neither mentioned in words nor is it a matter under discussion? (And) if (a stem) ending in *puk* or having a light penultimate can be qualified by *kṅit* even when (the stem is) subordinate, why should there be a spite against qualifying the Guṇa-Vṛddhi (by it)? — As regards what is said, viz. ' neither mentioned in words nor a matter under discussion ', — in this respect we say : The presence is not by reason of word or by (being) the topic under discussion alone. Presence is also (justified) by capacity to fulfil an expectation. And here (it is stated): Guṇa and Vṛddhi do not take place when a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix) follows. (Naturally) an expectation arises : (in) whose (place)? Or, when a suffix is mentioned by the word *kṅiti*, (the word) *aṅgam* presents itself (automatically); thus ' a stem ending in *puk*, or having a light vowel ' is brought in owing to its capacity to fulfil an expectation. And as to the other statement : ' why should there be a spite against qualifying Guṇa-Vṛddhi? ' (the reply is :) Even if Guṇa-Vṛddhi is qualified, (the prohibition) is not available when there is intervention. (Do you ask) how? Just as *yaṇ* proceeds because, there being immediacy even after *yaṇ* comes into being, (the Pari. P. 1. 1. 66) becomes operative, resulting into the statement : *ik* which is immediately followed by *ac* is replaced by *yaṇ*; similarly here (also) there will certainly be immediacy of Guṇa and Vṛddhi, even after they come into being, with *kṅiti*. The result, then, will be that prohibition will not be there where *ik*, the original for the potential Guṇa, is not immediately close. So (ultimately) the same drawback is there, as when the prohibition is qualified (by *kṅiti*). Therefore imme-

diacy of *pugantalaghūpadha* has to be resorted to, in which case the *anantara*-Paribhāṣā (i. e. P. 1. 1. 66) is helped to operate. The meaning which then results is this : when a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix) follows immediately, there is no Guṇa (substitution) for *puganta-laghūpadha*. *Aṅgasya* '(in the place) of *aṅga*' is not read. Any and every stem does not undergo Guṇa and Vṛddhi. What then? A particular stem, viz. the one after which a *sārvadhātuka* or an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix follows. "By *puganta-laghūpadhasya* is not understood ..." It is not the whole (that is) mentioned here. What then? a part. And that is intervened. Hence the non-availability of the prohibition. There is no (prohibition of Guṇa substitute) for a light penultimate when a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix) follows.

[2. 2]

"Defect with regard to *śa* and what ends in *caṅ*". If *tannimitta* is read (in the rule), Guṇa caused by another (suffix) becomes due, as in *riyati* when *śa* follows. — But there is no defect if the word *tannimitta* is read. (For) *guṇa* (is) external, (and) prohibition internal. (What is) external (is) technically non-existent with reference to the internal. He will mention this alternative solution under "*roravītī*". — Here the reason for adopting this viz. *śacaṅante* etc.) is explained thus : you think that the *tannimitta* alternative is free from defect; (but no!) in that (view) also there is a defect.

[2. 3]

"*Hataḥ, hathaḥ*". The first (of the two views mentioned in the *Mbh.* under P. 3. 1. 31) is here adopted. He thinks thus : Just as (*śap* etc., or *āya* etc.,) (looked upon as) taught by means of independent sentences, are made to withdraw by (the rules) *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ* (P. 2. 4. 72) or by *āyādaya ārdhadhātuke vā* (P. 3. 1. 31), similarly, this phoneme *a* also, uttered in the *Dhātupāṭha* withdraws before *kit* or *ṅit* suffixes. "Of that which has become due (but) has not yet materialized". Why are both said? Why should not either of the two (alone) be said? — (Both) have to be said for this reason : If 'of that which has become due' is alone said, what has become due is of two kinds : what has materialized and what has not materialized. — If so, let there be 'of that which has not yet materialized' alone. — That also is of two kinds : what has become due, and what has not become due. Therefore, both *prasakta* ... and *anabhinirvṛtta*, because prohibition of existence of that which has not materialized proceeds, both have been mentioned.

The idea behind this also is this : Here some Guṇa is already existent, as in *hataḥ, hathaḥ* etc. Some has to be laid down as in *kartā*, when *tṛc* follows, without the reading (of Guṇa); (Here *ik*) is uttered (in the stem), for which Guṇa (substitute) is laid down, when *tṛc* follows. That (Guṇa) is further made

to withdraw when a *kit* or *ṅit* suffix follows. Such being the case, this prohibition (P. 1. 1. 5) causes (the Guṇa) which is being laid down, to withdraw, just because such a one is there, and not the one which already exists. Here (in the case of *śap* etc.), however, there is no other *śap*, nor *āya* etc., and so though already there, they have to be made to withdraw.

" *Upoyate* ". The Guṇa depending on both the Padas is external. Even so what has become due but has not materialized can be prohibited ... ?

" *Auyate* ". Here since the cause of *āṭ* is external, Vṛddhi also is external.

" *Lauyamānaḥ* ". The Vṛddhi owes itself to an external cause.

" In *anenijuḥ*, because it is intervened by the succeeding part " (there will be no prohibition). What is the *prima facie* view ? — The same as in the case of *pugantalaghūpadhasya* (P. 7. 3. 86) viz. that (the word-element) in whose place Guṇa is laid down is qualified as being followed by a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix). The final view : while the Guṇa-replacement belongs to the reduplication, this (latter) is intervened.

[2. 4]

" We shall make the being followed by a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix) a qualification of the root ". The root is present as a topic under discussion because of employment of the Svarita accent. There either the meaning is inferred or the word. Meaning is inferred, (i. e.) the meaning of a word not present is inferred which (thus inferred) ' employes ' the word. Or the word is inferred, from which (thus inferred) the meaning is ascertained. From what is expressly read and from what is inferred an entirely new sentence emerges as the conveyer of meaning. A sentence comes into being viz. ' when a *kit* or *ṅit* (suffix) follows, there is no Guṇa (in the place) of an immediately preceding root '.

" If the root is made to be qualified, (the prohibition) is not available in the case of a *vikaraṇa* ". — This is the idea. The word *dhātu* ' root ' is not made to continue in order to prevent the prohibition from applying to the *vikaraṇa*. There is (another) reason for its continuation viz. it is (then) possible, on the strength of continuation, to understand (*kṅiti*) as a qualifier of what is not the principal. " The word *dhātu* qualifies *vihita* ' laid down ' ". A remainder of the sentence is supplied, since a Sūtra is to be furnished (with necessaries). (The *sū.* now means :) (Guṇa-substitution) does not take place when (a word-element) which (is) related to the root follows. What is related to the root ? The one that is laid down after it. The other (desputant), thinking that the sentence is to be completed as ' (there) is no (Guṇa in the place) of what is laid down after

a root' says : "Then (the prohibition) is not available for the root itself". The other confirms that *kṅiti* has another sentence remainder with equal scope, saying : "It is not to be understood that ... ".

"Or, grammatical names and Paribhāṣās belong to the time of operation". How is this (P. 1. 1. 5) a Paribhāṣā ? Reply : The word *guṇa-vṛddhī* is continued (here). Therefore, this (rule) has to present itself where Guṇa and Vṛddhi are laid down by uttering (the words) *guṇaḥ, vṛddhiḥ*. Here Guṇa is laid down by (P. 7. 3. 86) *pugantalaghūpadhasya* ... such being the case, because of the statement of *pugantalaghūpadhasya* united with *kṅiti* and *na* into a single statement, the prohibition will take place because of the dictum : 'Where intervention by (an element) cannot but be there, there (a rule proceedes) in spite of intervention by it, because of the authoritativeness of the rule'.

"Or (the mention of *kṅit*) in this rule ... ". This (P. 1. 1. 5) may not be a Paribhāṣā ; still Guṇa and Vṛddhi do not proceed to those cases where prohibition is expected. Otherwise, once they proceeded, it would be difficult to prohibit them. Also this form of prohibition, viz. *kṅiti*, accepts immediacy, only in view of (the particular Guṇa and Vṛddhi) to be prohibited. So there will be as many prohibitive sūtras as the (Guṇa-Vṛddhis) to be prohibited. Therefore, when the Guṇa for *pugantalaghūpadha* is to be prohibited there will (otherwise) be no scope for the prohibition and so it will apply in spite of intervention.

Others explain (differently thus:) The *kāryakāla* view about the grammatical names and the Paribhāṣās has been illustrated; now the solution according to the *yathoddeśa* view is being stated. (According to this view) the principal (i. e. injunctive) rules are different (or many). So when they approach the region of the subordinate rules (i. e. the Paribhāṣās) they bring about a plurality in the subordinate rules. Such being the case, we get repetitions of *kṅiti* for every principal rule. "Or, the procedure of the teacher indicates ... ". This is an indication (showing) that the *anantara paribhāṣā* does not present itself here, or that even if it presents itself here, still being devoid of a specially mentioned limb, presents itself only to teach the prohibition in the case of what precedes in general. Or, (*kṅiti* is to be understood as) a qualifier of Guṇa and Vṛddhi even though they are subordinate. Or, what is mentioned as undergoing Guṇa, that is made to be qualified by 'having a *kit* or *ṅit* suffix) following'.

[3]

"No (operation caused in connection with what precedes by a suffix when the latter is deleted by a word laying down deletion) which contains *lu*". This is said by accepting the variant reading. Even with the text as it is, even then (there is no harm. For,) *lumatā* (is interpreted as) an Instrumental (indicat-

ing) a characteristic of (someone or something) as (the person or the thing) exactly is. (So P. 1. 1. 63 means :) The stem which is characterised by (deletion caused by) a word containing *lu-* is not subject to the operation (concerned). Now even supposing that *aṅgasya* is furnished with a Svarita accent " Even then ... grammatical names and Paribhāṣās belong to the time of the operation ", and so this (P. 1. 1. 5) belongs to that region itself. Its utterance here, however, is (merely) for the sake of economy. " Or, Guṇa (is) external, the prohibition internal ". Such being the case, how can something to be prohibited, when it does not exist, be made to withdraw by the prohibition ? " Or, the word *ārdhadhātuka-* which (is there) in the previous rule (P. 1. 1. 4), that is without a scope ". (Objection :) The word *ārdhadhātuka* (is) for qualifying both, and so it (can) be said to have a scope. — True. It is so. Only if there can be a Bahuvrīhi in the absence of the word *ārdhadhātuka*, as in *ekāco dve* ··· (P. 6. 1. 1), then this is reasonable. In *roravīti*, the deletion is not caused by it (i. e. an *ārdhadhātuka*) and so there is no prohibition (of Guṇa). Such being the case, this word *ārdhadhātuka-* is for this purpose, viz. (to indicate that) each and every possibility of prohibition when there is a deletion of (a part of) a root does not materialize when (a suffix named) *sārvadhātuka* follows. As to those who plead that the word *ārdhadhātuka* has a scope, in that it is to prevent (the application of the prohibition) in *johorti*, (they) should be told that this is not a form of *hurch*, but of *hu* with a prefix *ruṭ* (for the finite ending) as in *devā aduhra*.

[4]

" Why does (the prohibition) not take place in *laigavāyanaḥ* (and) *kāmayate* ? " On the view that *iko guṇavṛddhī* (P. 1. 1. 3) supersedes *alo'ntyasya* (P. 1. 1. 52) even the Guṇa taught for *u* (P. 6. 4. 146) is for *ik* as such. " (There is no prohibition) in connection with a Taddhita and the *kam* because it belongs to the topic of *ik* ". The supersession (of P. 1. 1. 52 by P. 1. 1. 3) view is rejected. The production of a Genitive (and) the subordination (of 1. 1. 3 to P. 1. 1. 52) view stands. Therefore (this Guṇa) is not taught for *ik* as such. (Here) *ik* is there (by *anuvṛtti*). Similarly *guṇavṛddhī*. So (the resultant meaning of the rule is) that those Guṇa and Vṛddhi, which are taught for *ik* by uttering the words Guṇa and Vṛddhi, do not take place (when a *kit* or *ṅit* suffix follows).

[5]

" Extension of the status of the original to the substitutes because of the possession of the code-letter *ṅ* on the part of the *lakāra*(*s*) " (*Vār.* 5). A substitute receives an operation like an original, without needing a rule, on account of the extension of the status of the original (to it) ; (in the present case) it just

(means) that Guṇa and Vṛddhi do not lake place. Or, a rule does not need a cause. This rule *kṅiti* applies to a substitute as to an original. It does not need (to consider) whether a (necessary) cause is there or not. Or, a designation does not need the presence of the (relevant) thing : whether (the designated) has *ṅ* or not. — Extension of the status of the original, of any kind whatsoever, is not possible here, as the operation (concerned) relates to a phoneme (viz. *ṅ*). For example there is absense of (a word-element) beginning with a *val* (i. e. a consonant excepting *y*) (in the gerundive suffix *-ya*) in (e. g. the form) *pradīvya*). — If so, then Guṇa becomes due when *lyap* follows. So it is interpreted thus : The prohibition (applies) when *al* (the phoneme) is taken as having the original for its resort. The code-letter (*k*), however, is not there in the original, since it is declared that the one which has the name *it* is not present here. The *val* (i. e. *t*) is present in the original, so the prohibition takes place.

Even then the Guṇa aught to take place here. For it is thus said in the third *Adhyāya* (of the *Mbh.*) : 'what is *pit* (is) not *ṅit*, and what is *ṅit* is not *pit*'. Such being the case, (here) in *acinavam* there is neither *pit-* status because of *ṅit-* status, and neither *ṅit-* status because of *pit-* status. When both the *pit-* status and the *ṅit-* status are thus cancelled, Guṇa depending on the (following) *sārvadhātuka* (suffix) is certainly established. — This is an idea of the Bhāṣyakāra, not of the Vārttlkakāra. Hence this objection.

[5. 1]

" (The object is) achieved because of the statement that *yāsuṭ* is *ṅit*". (To explain :) Since *liṅ* is *ṅit*, its substitutes (the finite endings) are *ṅit* necessarily ; and *yāsuṭ* is an integral part of them, so its *ṅit* status is established. But (the teacher) sees that there is no *ṅit* status depending on the extension of the status of original (to the substitute). He therefore undertakes (to declare) the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ*. " If this is indicated, how about (the rules) *nityaṁ ṅitaḥ* (P. 3. 4. 99), *itaś ca* (P. 3. 4. 100) ? " An objection here (against this question) : It is not stated there thus, viz. that there takes place a deletion of a *ṅit* substitute. For, if the (rule) were understood thus, there will be deletion (of the finite endings) in *pacāvaḥ*, *pacanti*. How, then (is the rule to be understood) ? (It is understood as meaning that there is deletion) of the Parasmaipada (endings, which are the substitutes) of a *ṅit lakāra*. Such being the case, how is it that it is asked : " If this is indicated, how about (the rules) *nityaṁ ṅitaḥ* (P. 3. 4. 99), *itaś ca* (P. 3. 4. 100) ? — This is the idea : The inference about the prohibition of *ṅit* status, which proceeds from the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ*, should be so formulated that the *ṅit* status becomes firmly prohibited. How (is) the *ṅit* status firmly prohibited ? If the *ṅit* status of the original itself is uprooted. (The inference is :) Surely the *lakāra* itself does not get the

designation '*ṅit*', as a result of which *yāsuṭ* is declared to be *ṅit*. — (But then) for what purpose is this suffixion of the code letter *ṅ* ?—For special operations, such as *liṅaḥ sīyuṭ* (P. 3. 4. 102), *luṅlaṅlṛṅkṣv aḍ udāttaḥ* (P. 6. 4. 71).

" The operation which (becomes due) when a *ṅit* follows, that does not take place ; the operation which a *ṅit* has to undergo, that takes place ". The meaning of the Sūtra : Just as the exclusion of the status of the original is not there for the reason that there is a substitute for a *lakāra* with a code-letter *ṅ* ; it is not that the designation itself is uprooted. If (it is asked) 'why so' ? (the reply is :) " Because of the very declaration of the *ṅit*(-status) of *yāsuṭ* ". Verily an inference that cannot be formulated (in a particular way) should not be (so) formulated. And here it cannot be assumed that the kind of operation (which obtains) when a *ṅit* (suffix) follows cannot (obtain) when *yāsuṭ* follows. ...

In this way both can be accommodated : the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ*, and this (pair of rules), viz. *nityaṁ ṅitaḥ* (P. 3. 4. 99) and *itaś ca* (P. 3. 4. 100) (also finds a scope). Otherwise, where will it be (applicable) ? The whole status of *ṅit* will be uprooted by the indication. — And what operation (obtains) when *yāsuṭ* follows ? Prohibition (of Guṇa) (laid down) by (the rule) *kṅiti ca* and *saṁprasāraṇa*. And it is possible to dispense with the mention of *tannimitta*. Therefore, from the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ* only this can be inferred, viz. that there is no *ṅit* status (for the substitutes) resulting from the extension of the status of the original. As regards the designation of the *lakāra* as *ṅ*, (the Bhāṣyakāra) explains, as a sign of its withdrawl (from substitutes), the passage " And *yāsuṭ* is incapable in the matter of (investing) the whole (suffix) with the *ṅit* status ". *Aparyāpta* means *asamartha* 'incapable' ; if in the matter of investing the whole (suffix) with the *ṅit* status it is incapable, there is no prohibition of Guṇa by the rule '*kṅiti* (*ca*)' when the whole (suffix) follows. And if the whole (suffix) had the *ṅit* status by reason of the extension of the status of the original, the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ* (would be) superfluous.

(Objection :) A mark affixed to a part does become a qualifier of the whole. And so *yāsuṭ* (is) capable of investing the whole (suffix) with the *ṅit* status. Reply : The view of Grammar is that augments are incapable (of it). (To illustrate :) (P. 4. 3. 23) reads as : ... *ṭyuṭyulau tuṭ ca*. Here the *ṭit* status of the suffix is established by adding the code-letter *ṭ* to (the augment so as to read) *tuṭ*. Why are then the suffixes (also) read with the code letter *ṭ* ? And, moreover, there is a possibility of a defect (in this procedure). (Take the example :) *agnicit brāhmaṇī* 'a Brāhmaṇa lady who has piled up the altar'. Here, since (the augment) *tuk* has an *uk* (i. e. *u*) as a code-letter, the whole (noun *agnicit*) has a code letter *uk* as a result of which the feminine suffix *ṅīp* will

become due. — No harm. There is no possibility (of *ṅīp*) in *ukhāsrad brāhmaṇī* as stated in *ugity añcatigrahaṇāt siddham adhātoḥ* (*Vār*. 3 on P. 4. 1. 6). — Well, then here, in *paṭhitā vidyā* 'learning is acquired', *ṅīp* becomes due because of the *ṭit* status of *iṭ* ... *saṁprasāraṇa* and the prohibition of Guṇa can be effected. Therefore it is said : "*yāsuṭ*, on the one hand, is incapable in the matter of the *ṅit* status ... ".

[5. 2]

Others explain (this *Mbh.*) thus : The meaning of *nityaṁ ṅitaḥ* (P. 3. 4. 99) is just this, viz. that this operation (deletion of the final *s* of the endings *-vas* and *-mas*) belongs to the *ṅit* substitutes. — How is there no (deletion of *-s*) in *pacāvaḥ, pacāmaḥ*? (For) this is said there, viz. that a suffix named *sārvadhātuka* is like *ṅit*, if it does not have a code-letter *p*. — (The suffix) *vat* has the sense of Locative. Therefore *ṅidvat* means 'like a following *ṅit*'. To the context of that earlier extension belongs this declaration of the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ*. On the one hand, where there is the designation of *ṅit* in Genitive (*ṅitaḥ*) (there the substitutes have) the designation (*ṅit*) owing to the extension of the status of the original. When, however, the designation is in Locative (*ṅiti*), there is no extension of the status of the original. In this way both are accommodated, the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ* and this (*ṅit* status) also, mentioned in (P. 3. 4. 99 :) *nityaṁ ṅitaḥ*. For otherwise where will this be applicable, if the whole *ṅit*-status is uprooted by the indication ? Hence the inference.

[5. 3]

The text of others : "*Yāsuṭ* is certainly incapable (? quite capable) of (lending) a *ṅit*-status to the whole ". *Yāsuṭ* is incapable (? quite capable) of (lending) a *ṅit*-status, as it is an integral part (of it). Or, *yāsuṭ* is quite capable of (lending) a *ṅit*-status to the whole. (There is an unexpressed) remainder of the sentence (in the Sū. viz.) : *liṅ*. "And (he) furnishes it with *ṅ* ". What does this signify ? Well, he thus accepts just this : "*yāsuṭ* (comes before) the Parasmaipada endings (of *liṅ*); (it is) Udātta. And the *liṅ* has a *ṅit* status. "

Others say : by *udātto ṅic ca*, this is (what is) extended : when this follows, operations take place as when a *ṅit* (element) follows. If either a designation or an operation were available by an extension of the status of the original, the furnishing (of *yāsuṭ*) with a *ṅit*-status would be superfluous.

* * *

" (There is no Guṇa or Vṛddhi substitution) for *dīdhī-*, *vevī-* and *iṭ* " (P. 1. 1. 6).

[1]

" Since *dīdhī* and *vevī* belong to the domain of the Chandas " (*Vār.*). As far as these two are concerned, there is no usage of them in the post-Vedic Sanskrit.

" And since (the usage which is) seen has to be grammatically provided for accordingly " (*Vār.*). (Objection :) But even in the case of post-Vedic Sanskrit what is seen is alone grammatically provided for accordingly, cf. (the *Vār.*) *lokato 'rthaprayukte śabdaprayoge* ' the use of words being prompted by meaning in accordance with the world '. — So the meaning is thus explained : " In (the case of) the Chandas there is, on the one hand, a making of provision accordingly, for what is seen " and, on the other, there is no such usage in the Chandas, viz. *ādīdhyanam* and *ādīdhyakaḥ*. The Chandases have fixed words and (their) relationship (with meaning). Or ' since (the usage which is) seen has to be provided for accordingly ' means : Just as, since Guṇa is not seen and so there is a provision made accordingly, similarly (since) Guṇa is seen also, a provision accordingly will have to be made. And if you are thinking as to how it is known that the Guṇa is seen, therefore he says : " *adīdhet adīdhayuḥ* ". And this Guṇa is seen, (the *Vār.* says) : *guṇadarśanāt* " Because the Guṇa is seen ". Or, *guṇadarśanāt* (can be explained differently thus) : Other similar (irregularities of) Chandases also are seen and a grammatical provision has been made for them ; this too, should be inserted among them. — And what is it said to be ? The statement of *bahulam* ' variously '. Guṇa is seen in *adīdhet* and *adīdhayuḥ*. And this (Guṇa) cannot be established without a statement, if the (present) rule (P. 1. 1. 6) is formulated. *Adīdhet* is *laṅ* (Imperfect) with an irregular Parasmaipada ending. Guṇa is similarly seen in *adīdhayuḥ*. (The form *adīdhet* occurs in) *Prajāpatir vai yat kiṁcana manasādīdhet. tad ādhītayajurbhir ... yajuṣṭvam.*

This (form) is derived in the *Nirukta* from *dhyai*. Thus runs the commentary there : *Prajāpatir vai ... āptavān iti.* Similarly, *Hotrāya vṛtaḥ kṛpayann adhīdhet* (ṚV 10. 98. 7b). This, too, is from *dhyai*. (The *Nir.* 2. 12) paraphrases this thus : *Hotrāya vṛtaḥ kṛpāyamāṇo 'nvadhyāyat.* When such is the case, how is *dīdhīṅ* concerned here when it is said " Because the Guṇa is seen " ?—This is no defect. This form is from *dīdhīṅ* ; only the meaning is stated in terms of another grammatical root synonymous with it, as e. g. the meaning of *kṣaṇ* (cl. VIII) is explained in terms of *kṣṇu* (cl. II) (when the *Nir.* 2. 25 says :) *kṣaṇaḥ kṣaṇoteḥ prakṣṇutaḥ kālō bhavati*. The root *kṣṇu* means to decrease.

[2]

"May be, this (viz. *adīdhet* is) a proper example" for rejecting the rule. This other, "viz. *adīdhayuḥ*", however, is not affected even if the rule is there. "This Guṇa, caused by the following *jus* is effective in the domain of the prohibition. — This is no defect. It supersedes (a prohibition) belonging to the same class. And which one belongs to the same class? The one depending on the suffix". For, it (i. e. *jusi guṇaḥ*) has a simultaneity with it. This prohibition (P. 1. 1. 6), however, independent of the suffix and depending on the base alone, proceeds (first), being an internal operation. How can it be superseded by the rule which teaches Guṇa before the following *jus* as it (the latter) belongs to a later time? Perhaps it may be the view (of the opponent), that (there can be) no prohibition without a suffix. Even though it is so, still, (there is) no express mention of the suffix in so many words.

"Or, *yena nāprāpta* etc." *Yena nāprāpte* means *yena nāprasakte* 'when something has inevitably become due'. Or (it means) ... It supersedes that rule. Whence? Because it has no scope with reference to it (i. e. in the domain of that other rule). However, when (the other rule) has (partly) become due and (partly) not become due, it has a scope with reference to it: that domain which has not been occupied, that is its domain. But this is possible when rules are expected to proceed two at a time. When, however, a number of rules are considered simultaneously, then a simultaneous application of more than one rule is expected. Then (it) supersedes all because (otherwise) it has no scope. Also when an operation in general is understood, even then the entire domain is occupied by the operation and so there is necessarily a supersession.

[3]

"How (is) *dīdhyat* (accounted for)?". A part has been adduced as an example. Sometimes, however, (there is seen) use (of this word) with a prefixed *ni*-: '*Aindraḥ prāṇo aṅge aṅge ni dīdhyat* (*MaitrSaṁh.* 1. 2. 17). 'May Indra's expiration be set in every limb'.[1] If the rule (P. 1. 1. 6) is not there, Guṇa becomes due: *dīdhayat*. — "As regards *dīdhyat*, (there is) *śyan* irregularly". The high pitch is on the initial syllable (*dī*) because *śyan* has the code-letter *n*; (there is) prohibition of Guṇa because of the *ṅit*-status (of *śyan*). (There is) deletion (of *ī*) by *yīvarṇayoḥ* ... (P. 7. 4. 53) and, after it, the loss of pitch by *tiṅṅ atiṅaḥ* (P. 8. 1. 28). Similarly, even when *śa* follows, with Guṇa prohibited by (its) *ṅit* status, the loss of pitch, and the *yaṇ* substitution, (the resulting form is) the same. And that is how some read (the *Vār.*): "*Dīdhyad iti* (*ca*) *śa vyatyayena*" 'As regards *dīdhyat*, (there is) *śa*

1. Translation by Keith, *Tai. Saṁ.* 1. 3. 10.

irregularly '. Those who read ... *śab vyatyayena*, they also are confronted with Guṇa.

Well, what about this (text) : *Manasā dīdhyaj juhoti* (*MaitrSaṁh.* 3. 6. 4) '(He) offers, reflecting over in mind'. This is (present participle) ending in *śatṛ* (= *ant*). If *śyan* is added here, then *num* is bound to come in by *ugidacām* ... (P. 7. 1. 70), because of the intervention (of *abhyasta* and *śatṛ* by *śyan*). The pitch, however, is achieved because of the possession of the code-letter *n*. Now if *śa* is accepted (instead of *śyan*) there is no harm. After *śatṛ* has lost its pitch by ... *adupadeśāt* ... (P. 6. 1. 186) and (the two *a*'s) got a single substitute, there is prohibition of *num* by *nābhyastāc chatuḥ* (P. 7. 1. 78). Even if (one reads) *śab vyatyayena*, *vyatyaya* is thus interpreted : *śapo vyatyayena* means *śapo vyatigamanena* 'by the elision of *śap*' by *adiprabhṛtibhyaḥ śapaḥ* (P. 2. 4. 72). (With this elision, the desired form) is achieved. For, after its elision, there is immediate contiguity (of *abhyasta*) with *śatṛ*.

[4]

' When *iṭ* is [already] there " in *neḍ vaśi kṛti* (P. 7. 2. 8), the reading of *iṭ* once more (P. 7. 2. 35) is for this purpese : *iṭ* (remains) *iṭ* itself, it does not change form. (In other words) it stands without a change in its form.

" An operation which pertains to an *aṅga* is restrained ". The word *aṅgasya* continues. So what(ever) is taught in the jurisdiction of *aṅgasya*, there the form of *iṭ* does not cease. — How (is) *grahītṛ* (to be explained) ? (Reply :) Because of the specific rule (P. 7. 2. 37). How *pipaṭhīṁṣi brāhmaṇakulāni*? (For) the length taught in *sāntamahataḥ* ... (P. 6. 4. 10) does not become available because of the restriction (regarding operations taught under) *aṅgasya*. But *num* itself, taught by *napuṁsakasya jhalacaḥ* (P. 7. 1. 72) cannot be here. There when the elision of *a* is effected (by P. 6. 4. 48) (the nominal stem) does not end in a *jhal* consonant owing to the extension of the status of the original. — All right. (The *num* will come in) because of the stem ending in a vowel (by the *ac*- part of the same rule). Even this *num*, which has a code-letter *m* has to come 'after the final vowel' and so it is not an operation concerning what precedes (the *sthānin*). Even so the phoneme *i* is not final because of the extension of the status of the original as a result of which *mid aco 'ntyāt paraḥ* is not (complied with). So the (correct form) should be *pipaṭhiṣi brāhmaṇakulāni*.

" Or, the lengthening is technically non-existent. Because of its technical non-existence the restriction will not apply ". Since lengthening is not (recognised) in Grammar, this (*iṭ*) is unchanged in form (as far as Grammar is

concerned); it is only in the actual usage that it is with a changed form. — But then this defect is seen there : (The correct forms) *alāvīt, apāvīt* cannot be had. And if it is the idea that this is a substitute of two (originals), *iṭ* and non-*iṭ*, this will not do. For, in Grammar, that which takes the place of two (originals) mentioned in the Genitive, it gets the designation of both. Therefore, it seems better (to resort to the solution) : " That operation which is taught for an *aṅga*, that (alone) is restrained ".

* * *

" Immediate consonants (are named) *saṁyoga* " (P. 1. 1. 7).

[1]

" How is this to be understood ? " — Whence (this) question ? — If it relates to word, it is not reasonable because the word *anantara* is heard. — The question (is asked) because the word *antara* has many meanings. This word, verily, is seen (used) in connection with ' middle ' (?), ... ' gap ', ' region ' ' connection with outside ' and ' garment '. — Out of these, the meaning ' gap ' alone (is applicable here) because of its possibility. So this is not the question.

" How is this (word) *anantarāḥ* to be understood ? (As meaning) those (consonants) between which there is no gap " ? *Antara, vivara, chidra, madhya* are synonyms. And, what kind of gap in word (is meant) ? — The intervening time which (is) devoid of phonemes. " Or, those (consonants), between which there are no (phonemes) ? " Here the Accusative case becomes due. We shall tell its remedy later on. Here some read the text as : *avidyamānam antaram yeṣām*. With this (text) there is of course no (cause for) application of the Accusative.

Well, is this analytical expressin to be read at the end ? — No, says he. — What then ? — This (is what) he asks : In *halo 'nantarāḥ* there are two (*anantara-*) words. One (of them) denotes the meaning of (a word) other than the constituent (words of the compound), (meaning) which is qualified by the non-existent substratum (i. e. time). The other, too (denotes the meaning of the word which is other than constituents of the compound) (meaning which is qualified) by the substratum which is not ruled out and which does not expect the thing to be supported (i. e. phonemes). Or, there is this one word only, having more than one power. (So he asks :) Which word (of these two) or, (alternatively) (the word with which power) is accepted out of regard for (particular) linguistic examples ?

" The name *saṁyoga* does not become available where there is separation (of Vedic words in the Padapāṭha) e. g. in *apsu iti ap-su*. For there is a gap

here." Separation is regarded as having a duration of half a mora. Having observed a pause for half a mora (in recitation) the next phoneme is uttered. But what defect will be there? A prolated vowel taught by *guror anṛto 'nantyasya* ... (P. 8. 2. 86) will not be there. — (Objection:) But (a word) expressive of location has no connection with (rules) like *guror anṛta* ... (Answer:) well, then (a pluta) will not be there in *apsavya*.

"Let it be such so that there will be no defect." This science formulates rules in accordance with the usage of the cultured people. There, a stand is taken in such a way that the practice of the cultured people is not contradicted. "Neither a defect, nor a purpose". The name *saṁyoga* is resorted to either to avoid some defect or for achieving some purpose. And as here is neither a defect if (the name) does not apply, nor a purpose (achieved) if it applies, so the name *saṁyoga* does not proceed. — (Objection:) But it was said that a prolated vowel will not be there where there is separation, (e. g.) in *apsavya*.—(Reply:) They do not desire separation. In Grammar, too, there is just no rule for separation in a single Pada in the jurisdiction of *saṁhitāyām*. (There is) close contiguity and absence of close contiguity in Grammar. Others explain: The word *ap-* gets the name *bha* by *yaci* ... (P. 1. 4. 18) in the same way as in *paramavācā* the word *vāc* (gets the name *bha*) by continuation of *tadādi subantaṁ ca*. — (But) that is not correct, because of the intervention. For here the word *ap-* is intervened (by the ending *-su* from the suffix *ya*), while the word *vāc* is immediately close (to the ending *-ā*). — Well, here then, in words like *apsuyoni*, *apsumati*, (the name *saṁyoga*) does not become due. — Here, too, there is no separation. For, thus it is said: 'The end of words named *samāsa* is separated'. And a word including the case-ending is named *samāsa*; the word *ap* is not (so).

[2]

The name *saṁyoga* is connected, in Grammar, with every individual (consonant) since elsewhere (where connection with individual is not desired) the word *saha* 'jointly' is used. As for (the condition) 'immediacy' it is just a mark for recognition: (consonants) marked by immediacy get the name severally. Just as, when it is said 'Let water for washing feet and sipping be given to the Brāhmaṇas who are (sitting) immediately near each other', (the Brāhmaṇas) who are in immediate contact are made to receive (it), each one severally. Only that which is not possible (to be so given), (they) receive jointly. When it is said 'Let a maiden be given to them' it is understood (to mean) 'Let this maid servant be given to them'.

"As elsewhere also". If *saha* is not read in (the rule teaching) the name *samāsa*, then this meaning will result: When, (e. g.) a noun in Genitive

is used (compounded) with another one by the rules *ṣaṣṭhī* (P. 2. 2. 8) and ... *samāsaḥ* (P. 2. 1. 3) the name *samāsa* proceeds. It will not apply to the whole (jointly). It will apply to each one individually. In *ṛkpāda* and *rājāśva* (e.g.), a *samāsānta* suffix will become due after every constituent; and similarly (the high) pitch. Similarly if the word *ubhe* (in P. 6. 1. 5), a synonym of *saha*, is not read, there will be two names *abhyasta*, one for each constituent. Similarly here close contact is not a property of a single object, like end or beginning. What then? This is a property of two. In the absence of the word *saha* the name *saṁyoga* will become due for each one of the two (consonants) marked by a close contact.

" So what ? " This is the idea : Even if the name *saṁyoga* is there for one (consonant), the name *guru* is established for the preceding (vowel) by *saṁyoge guru* (P. 1. 4. 11).

" *e*-substitution will result undesiredly in *niryāyāt*. " The name *saṁyoga* (is there) for each one because of close contact between *r* and *y*; so, with *y* (as the initial), the stem (*aṅga*) is such as begins with a *saṁyoga*. Which (form) is excluded ? — *yāyāt*, *vāyāt*. And, when the name *saṁyoga* is there for the whole group and reduplication is done by *aco rahābhyāṁ dve* (P. 8. 4. 46) (the substitute *e*) does become due. — Because of the technical non-existence (of reduplication) the name *saṁyoga* will not be there — that is the way out of the difficulty on the *yathoddeśa* view.

" And here, in *dṛṣat karoti* ". Elision (of the final *d*) will result undesiredly by (dissolving the compound as) *saṁyogaḥ ante yasya* 'that which has a *saṁyoga* at the end'; or by Extension of Special Designation.

" And here in *śaktā*, *vastā* ". Elision of the *saṁyogādi* will result undesiredly. When there is close contact between *k* and *t* and between *s* and *t*, then *s* and *k* are *saṁyogādi* in the sense that both are *saṁyoga*-s and both are also the first among the *saṁyoga*-s. Even if (*saṁyogādī* is dissolved as) *saṁyogayar ādī*, (the two phonemes) *s* and *k* precede the two *saṁyoga*-s where *t* is preceded by *s* (in one) and by *k* (in another) (i. e. *-st* and *-kt*).

" This (word) *saṁyogādi* means (a word) having two *saṁyoga*-s at the beginning ". (Objection :) But it is said that in a synthetical formation a subordinate word cannot take on a particular number. — That is certainly true. Still, on the view that a nominal stem has a fivefold meaning number, which is an adjunct of the nominal stem and which is revealed by case ending, that is not intended (to be expressed) in a synthetical formation. Even when a case ending is heard, it is not intended to be expressed, as e.g. in *dāsyāḥputraḥ*. Occasionaly, however, the specific number is certainly understood, (e. g.) in *māsajātaḥ* 'one month old', *śaurpikaḥ* 'bought for one śūrpaful of corn'. When (words of)

measurement are subordinate, these become expressive of a specific measure only. Sometimes (specific numbers) are revealed by the form of the substitute itself, (e. g.) *tāvakīnaḥ* 'belonging to you (sing.)', *māmakīnaḥ* 'belonging to me'. Similarly, here because of the use of the word *ādi*, (it is assumed that) the activity of a specific number is intended (to be expressed). How? This much needed to be said : *saṁyogād ātaḥ*. (This would have meant :) *e* is substituted in the place of *ā* which follows a *saṁyoga* occurring in an *aṅga*. This word *ādi* is used for this purpose, viz. that in this sentence a specific number is intended (to be expressed). (The idea is) that if it is capable in a subordinate word, then the word *ādi* occupying the position of a meaningful context can convey (the intended meaning). It is like inferring that the Taddhita suffix in *sārasvatau bhavataḥ* is affixed to the single remaining stem (from *sarasvān*+*sarasvatī*) from the indication : *mithunaṁ ha vā etad yad uta sarsvatī ca sarasvāṁś ca.*

Or, *aṅgasya* 'of the *aṅga*' and *ātaḥ* 'in the place of *ā*' are mentioned. And surely .... So this is inferred from it : Here immediate contact has not been introduced as a (mere) mark of identification. What then? (Two consonants) which are already in immediate contact are regarded as *saṁyoga*. In *niryāyāt* the first consonant (i. e. *r*) is not a part (of the *aṅga*). So there is no *e*-substitution.

Or, we understand it thus : This word *saṁyoga* (is to be taken as) indicative of immediate contact. Just as in the matter of suffixing *-vat* (to *pra* etc.), *nas-* substitution (for *nāsikā*) and other operations the word *upasarga* is merely indicative of *pra* etc.; the *pra* etc. are not bearers of that name (*upasarga*) in suffixion of *-vat*, *nas-* substitution and other operations, similarly, here also, in the case of *saṁyogādeḥ* (P. 8. 2. 43) (the expression) *saṁyoga* is merely indicative of immediate contact. So this is thus understood : where (two consonants,) connected with *aṅga*, and immediately connected with each other, constitute the beginning, there *ā* is replaced by *e*. Thus the intention of particular number is known either from (the use of) the word *ādi* or its use is indicative of just immediate contact.

" That which ends in two *saṁyogas* ". Here also the deletion of the final would have been similarly achieved, the *tadantavidhi* being (available) (even if the reading had been :) *saṁyogasya padasya*. Such being the case it is understood from the reading of the word *anta* (in the Sū.) that a specific number has been intended; or, that inherent immediate contact is meant; or, that the word *saṁyoga* is used figuratively in the sense of 'two immediate (consonants) belonging to a Pada'.

" *saṁyogādī*, whose Gen. du. is *saṁyogādyoḥ*, is not to be understood as *saṁyogāv ādī* 'two initial (consonants), (which are) *saṁyoga's* ". That

(*saṁyoga*) is presented (here) in dual because of the duality of the phonemes *k* and *s*. — Now, for what purpose is (the transformation of the first constituent) of *saṁyogādī* shown in the Nominative, instead of in the Genitive viz. *saṁyogasya ādī* 'the two initials of a *saṁyoga*'? — He thinks thus : the word *ādi* is expressive of a part, e. g. (in) *padādi, aṅgādi* etc.; 'its part' is understood. (But) in *śaktā* the phoneme *k* is not such a part of the *saṁyoga* phoneme *t*. That is why the Nominative, viz. *saṁyogāv ādī* is adopted. It means that this (is) the *ādi*, i. e. this (is) the *prathama* 'first' as a *saṁyoga*.

"The two initials of the two *saṁyoga*-s". The word *ādi*, expressive of a part, will (here) be expressive of the immediate : (it means a phoneme which is) *ādi*, i. e. *samīpa* 'immediately preceding' a *saṁyoga*.

— If so, then, when these two (*k* and *s*) are understood as immediately preceding the two *saṁyogas*, (the deletion) is not available in *kāṣṭhataṭ* 'wood-cutter'. For, here the immediately preceding (phoneme viz. *k*) is not the third. Here, in *taṣṭavya*, on the other hand, the phoneme *k* is there as the third, immediately preceding the phonemes *ṣ* and *ṭ*.

— Does not matter. (In *taṣṭavya*) the phoneme *t* being intended as a cause (of deletion) because of the expression *jhali* (in the Sū.), it is not included in the two *saṁyagas*. Here in *kāṣṭhataṭ* also *anta* is a cause. Therefore, this is the meaning of the Sūtra : The phonemes *s* and *k*, preceding a *saṁyoga* after which a *jhal* phoneme or *padānta* follows, are deleted. If so, there is no defect even if (*saṁyogādi-* is dissolved) as *saṁyogasya ādiḥ*. In *śaktā* the phoneme *t* is exhausted by qualifying the (phoneme) preceding the *saṁyoga* and so it cannot proceed (to act) as a cause. Nor is there any other *jhal*. So there will be no elision. Such being the case, by this means just this much has been said : The subordinate constituent in *skoḥ saṁyogādyoḥ* does not end in the Nominative. What then ? In the Genitive.

"*Niryāto nirvātaḥ* etc.". Here also the same interpretation should be adopted because of the reading of the word *dhātu* and *ādi*.

[2. 1]

"How, for each one severally ?" This is what is meant. This is indistinguishable logically. Further, the immediate contact which is heard (i. e. mentioned) in the definition of *saṁyoga*, why should it not be made an integral part (of the *saṁjñin*-s) ? Just as, when it is said, 'Bring those two clad in white', the white garments are included. Nor (can it be said) that it is made an integral part only where there is no (other) possibility. For, such a thing defined is seen in the world. Just as in the matter of fining (the Gargas) a hundred, the form of hundred which is desired (is) of this very nature (and)

...9

that itself takes effect; the Gargas are not fined a hundred (severally). Similarly, the immediate contact of that nature alone (is desired) which is made an integral part in the (definition of) the name *saṁyoga*.

[3]

" Now, when there is an immediate contact of more than two (consonants), does the name *saṁyoga* attach itself to two at a time or without (any such) specification ? " What kind of non-specification (is) here meant ? — The non-specification with relation to context. The specification which (is) introduced, viz ' two at a time ' is not resorted to in (the definition of) the name *saṁyoga*. When this is not there, ' of more than two ' (follows as a matter of course). Of (the other) specification, following from words, he will speak later, viz. ' Or, let it again be without specification (i. e. let it be) for two and also for more than two. When there is immediate contact between more than two, how does he plead for more than two alone ? Why not for two ? — Reply : Just as, in the matter of reduplication, when (both) parts and the whole have a reason (for being reduplicated), it is the whole alone which undergoes reduplication. And just as the designation *ekāc* ' one-vowel ' attaches to all : to *p*, to *a*, to *ac* and to *pac* — still the word *pac* alone is reduplicated. Similarly here also, in the word *uṣṭra* ' a camel ', there are more than two consonants in immediate contact : *ṣ*, *ṭ* and *r*; and (the two) *ṣ* and *ṭ* are in immediate contact, and so also *ṭ* and *r*. But in spite of the presence of immediate contact, the reason (for the name *saṁyoga*), (in both the classes, the name is got) by more than two (consonants) alone, not by two. But where there are two (consonants) only in immediate contact, the name *saṁyoga* is not denied to them. As to how two alone (also can have that name), he will explain later on.

[3. 1]

" If the whole (is named *saṁyoga*), the deletion of the initial of a *saṁyoga* (is not available) in the case of $\sqrt{masj}$- ". After *num* is inserted, there is immediate contact of three (consonants). $n + s + j$ (together) are called *saṁyoga*; not $n + s$, nor $s + j$. Deletion of the phoneme *s* of $\sqrt{masj}$ is not available, because it (i. e. *s*) is not the initial of a *saṁyoga*.

[3. 2]

" And here in *nirgleyāt*, *nirmleyāt*, *e*- substitution does not become available ". The *saṁyoga* which is here has nothing to do with the *aṅga*, while what belongs to it is not a *saṁyoga*. Where will it then be ? (In) *gleyāt*, *mleyāt*.

[3. 3]

" If *saṁyoga* (is a name) of two consonants, then reduplication cannot be established ". In *indidrīyiṣati* there are two *saṁyogas*. The intial of one is *n*, of other *d*, so prohibition (of reduplication) for both becomes due by P. 6. 1. 3 : *na ndrāḥ* ...

[3. 3. 1]

" Or rather not, for, the operation (of prohibition) depends on a (preceding) vowel ". Thus, indeed, has been said (in P. 6. 1. 2, *Vār*. 2) : '*dvitīyasya* should not be read (in the Sū.). *Ajādeḥ* is Ablative '. Here (P. 6. 1. 3) also *ajādeḥ* 'of (a phoneme) coming after a preceding vowel' is valid (from the previous Sū.). As a result of it there is prohibition (of reduplication) in the case of a consonant which leads a *saṁyoga* and follows immediately a vowel. No prohibition for the phoneme *d*.

[4]

" Or whether, on the one or the other view, the Sūtra will have to be modified ". One view here is quite reasonable viz. 'the name *saṁyoga* for more than two'. On the other view effort will have to be made if a desired (sound sequence) cannot be established (as *saṁyoga*) with (the wording) as it is. " '(It is) understood' he says ". This is the idea : Even when possibility of more than two is there, if the meaning adopted is such as is wholly impossible for more than two, then 'for two at a time' should result.

" This will then be the dissolution : *avidyamānam antaram eṣām*. The word *anantara* means *avivara* 'having no gap'. When close contact is there, more than two can be gapless; also two, in the same circumstance, can be gapless. However, the name *saṁyoga* does not apply to these two, the same as in the case of reduplication. It should not, however, be understood from the use of the plural number in *eṣām*, that the plural is based on (so many) items. For, if it were so, (the name) will never be there, if there are (only) two (consonants). " When 'for two at a time', dissolution will be thus : *avidyamānā antarā eṣām* ". Here the word *antarā* is used which conveys the meaning of location. He who is between, he (is) not (between) more than two. What then? (Between) two. And when (he) is not (between), then (he is not between) two only. So the name should apply to only those two between whom there can be intervention or no intervention. He expresses this idea in " Anybody can be between two only ". He says by " or not " that the name should apply to only those two between whom there can be (something), when that (thing) is not there.

[4. 1]

But how the Genitive here since, because of *antarāntareṇa yukte* (P. 2. 3. 4), the Accusative becomes due here? Reply : When the two boundaries are mentioned separately (from each other) as in : *tvāṁ ca māṁ ca* '(between) you and me', *gārhapatyaṁ cāhavanīyaṁ ca* '(between) Gārhapatya and Āhavanīya (fires)', (the word) proceeding as a boundary gets the Accusative. But when the mutual separateness is given up and the word proceeds merely as connected in a general way, it does not convey (meaning) as (a word expressive of) boundary. So, when it is said *dvayor antarā*, it is not known, whether the two (form boundaries) along with something else or they alone form two boundaries. That is why the Genitive is used, not the Accusative. — If so, how here : *tadvācinaḥ śabdasya prayogam antareṇa* 'in the absence of the use of a word denoting it (*Mbh.* on P. 1. 2. 64)? Similarly in *antareṇa varārohām*? Reply : this word *antareṇa* is a synonym of the word *vinā* 'without' and it also means *madhya* 'middle'. In connection with both these meanings the Accusative is taught by *antarāntareṇa yukte* (P. 2. 3. 4).

[4. 2]

"Even then (the name) becomes due for more-than-two only. Those which you refer by the Genitive ...". Some say that (the name) has to be for more-than-two because of the use of the word *eṣām* 'of these' (in the rule). That is not reasonable, because there is no intention to convey number in a sentence which intends to stress immediate contact. Immediate contact of as many consonants as there may be is all that is intended to be conveyed. For, otherwise, (the name) will not be there in *asva* etc. Therefore by this 'those between which there are no (vowels)' he teaches this : The one which is (or is not) in between (is, or is not, between) two and also between more-than-two. If there is nothing between more-than-two, why should not the same *saṁyoga* apply to them when they are in immediate contact? For, of three (consonants), the initial and the final are intervened, but not the middle. Such being the case, if (a phoneme) of dissimilar class is between more-than-two, (the name) does not apply to more-than-two.

"In the case of *masj*- (a *mit* augment) precedes the final". This has to be said necessarily for the sake of deletion of a penultimate nasal (in) *magna* 'immersed'.

[4. 3]

"Or, the name *saṁyoga* will be understood without any specification. (It will apply) to two and also to more-than-two". — How can this be said? For it has been said that the name *saṁyoga* aught to apply to the whole alone,

not to the parts, just as the reduplication of the one-vowel element applies to the whole and not to the parts. — This is the idea : Just as when the whole is reduplicated the parts also are (thereby) reduplicated; only, (there is) this difference : The one (is reduplicated) perceptibly, the other inferentially. The acquisition of the operation, however, is the same. Similarly, if, like the reduplication, here also an operation belonged to the parts (only) through the whole, then the parts of clusters do not get the operation resulting from the name *saṁyoga*. So the reduplication cannot be a parallel. Such being the case, why is it that the parts, which do not get an operation through the whole although desirous of it, do not get it even when there is a reason for the name (to apply) ? And just as in the case of reduplication, if a part is reduplicated it is not possible to reduplicate another part, or the whole, because of the conflict (involved) owing to the (only) vowel being already carried away, — there is no such conflict in the case of the name *saṁyoga*. For, there is a possibility that (there could be the name *saṁyoga*) for both the whole and the parts.

[4. 4]

" And, as regards what is said ... ". It looks that this passage should be properly after *vakṣyaty etad, antyāt pūrvo masjer iti.*

Well, is this a refutation of (the objection against the view :) ' The name *saṁyoga* for more-than-two only ' or of (the view :) ' The name *saṁyoga* without a specification ' ? According to one view (?), this refutation concerns (objections against the view which grants the name) to more-than-two. When a whole is not participating in the operation, how can the parts fail to get it ? And a whole is mentioned either as *ec*, or it is mentioned in its own form (of constituents) as *eoṅ aiauc*. Here immediate consonants, undetermined (in any other way) are defined as getting the name *saṁyoga*. Such being the case, when the *saṁyogādi* is qualified by *aṅgasya*, an immediate contact of three consonants is not intended. How can it then stand in the way of the name *saṁyoga* which is due to a close contact between the two ?

Others explain : The whole Bhāṣya is merely a restatement of the other view. As regards what was said by you : ' *saṁyoga* will be qualified by *aṅga* : that which is a *saṁyoga* here, it does not belong to the *aṅga* and what belongs to the *aṅga* is not a *saṁyoga* ', this is wrong. Whence ? Since the name *saṁyoga* belongs, without specification, to two, and also to more-than-two.

Yet others explain : (He) argues in this passage thus : What was described by you as the reason for non-availability (of the name *saṁyoga*) viz. because of qualification of *saṁyoga* by *aṅga*, that exactly is my reason for availability. For, here the *aṅga* does have a *saṁyoga* at the beginning, as the name *saṁyoga* applies without any specification.

[5]

" It should be stated that consonants not intervened by vowels are named *saṁyoga.* " For, otherwise the name *saṁyoga* becomes due even for (consonants) intervened by vowels. (E. g.) *pacati panasam.* Because of the (specific) mention *halaḥ*, there is no (undesired) possibility of (consonants) along with vowels (getting that name). But it becomes due for the very consonants. Here, *pacati* is an example regarding form. This one, viz. *panasam* is, however, an example regarding an operation. Some think that this is a list (of independent examples). Others, that (this is) a sentence. On this view, all the operations which are there, caused by the name *saṁyoga*, all of them (will become due).

[5. 1]

" These two villages are immediately close to one another. " Even when there is separation by a river or a hill, the two get the name immediate. Similarly here also consonants, even when intervened, get the status of ' immediate '. So the statement ' consonants unintervened by vowels ' should be made. — ' Then what on earth could be the purpose of the statement of *anantara* ? ' — This is the idea. If it is said ' two immediately close consonants ', then more-than-two will not have (the name). And (actually) the name does apply to more-than two when there is no intervention. You say that (the name should apply) to even two, even when they are intervened. In that case —

[5. 1. 1]

" What is the purpose of the word ' immediate ' ? The purpose is to prohibit (the application of the name) to one. " The domain is delimited by the word ' immediate. ' Where there is this (word) ' immediacy ', that should be understood to be the domain of the name *saṁyoga*. So a single consonant is ruled out. Thus the word ' immediate ' is purposive. (E. g.) *iyeṣa.* (Here) *ām* will force itself (undesiredly). But why the word ' heavy ' then ? It could be for excluding the root *i*(*ṇ*) ' to go ' which consists purely (of a vowel) and begins with a vowel other than *ā*.

[5. 2]

" Rather not. Because the heterogeneous (is said to cause) an intervention. " Verily, what is heterogeneous, that is an intervener. He draws a parallel from the world : " Thus, verily, somebody asks somebody (else) .... House of an outcaste ". Here a question (arises) : ' Is not even a house of a Brāhmaṇa, which is homogeneous, the intervener of those two ? ' — This is no defect. Not only this, but (what is) homogeneous also becomes an inter-

vener. Only, your view, viz. that what is heterogeneous is not an intervener is set aside. So, as in the world, here also (consonants) intervened by vowels do not have the name *saṁyoga*. It is not, even when there is intervention by consonant(s). In *uṣṭra* (there is no name) for *ṣ* and *r* because of the intervention by *ṭ*. Since there is no intervention when all the the three are taken together, the name does apply to them as also to *ṣṭ*- and *ṭr*-.

" But for what reason ... ? " Here a twofold behaviour of the word *anantara* ' immediate ' is seen. With respect to it he asks for a logical reason. What is the reason that the word *anantara* applies sometimes to what is intervened, and sometimes not ?

The other, believing that there is invariably an intervention by a heterogeneous one, says : " A heterogeneous one is everywhere an intervener. " " This word *grāma* has a plurality of meanings. " This (is what) he says : The word *anantara* has an invariably the same meaning. The word *grāma*, however, has a variety of meanings. Such being the case, in this usage, viz. *anantarāv imau grāmau*, here a particular meaning of the word *grama* is understood.

[5. 3]

Now, there is a difference of opinion as regards this plurality of meanings. Some think : (There are) different words (lit. words with different forms) themselves, pertaining to different sentences; the belief of their identity is due to sameness of forms. Others think : There is only one word with a plurality of expressive powers. But, out of regard for meaning, some particular power of it is intended in a particular sentence. But, as the Bhāṣya (stands), it appears that the words themselves are different. Thus, varily, is the re-capitulation there : " That (word), then, which includes in its meaning forest(s), boundaries... " If the distribution of expressive power were accepted, (' the word) then, when ' would have been said.

Therefore, since (every time) a different, particular activity is conveyed, the word *grāma*, proceeding with a different, particular meaning in every different sentence, has to be (regarded as) a conveyer of that sense. Such being the sense, this word *grāma* which is there in the sentence *anantarāv imau grāmau*, always includes in its meaning forest(s), boundaries. Therefore, since a river also is included, these two (villages) are immediate, not intervened, so the word *anantara* does not convey (what is) intervened.

[5. 4]

Now, when it is said : ' There is a village ', is it that all these meanings are conveyed simultaneously — men separately, the group of houses separately, and (the part covering) the boundaries and the hill(s) separately ? — There is

no such conveying. For, men etc. are included (by the speaker) in the meaning which includes forests; they do not require to be mentioned again, and so there is no possibility (of different constituent meanings being conveyed simultaneously). Therefore all the words are used in some particular meaning, but sometimes that is not abstracted by the listener. (He) understands, however, this much, that *some* meaning has been meant to be conveyed by him (the speakr). For this reason also (it is clear that) he does not understand, since he asks : ' which (meaning) is intended by you ? '

[5. 5]

The view of some, on the other hand, is thus : The main expressive power of this (word, *grāma*) (is) with reference to the surrounding wall. It is figurative with reference to men etc. due to their being there or nearby. This is so as in the case of (the village names) Nandigrāma, Mallagrāma. In spite of movement, both ways, of people residing in them, from one to the other, Nandigrāma does not become Mallagrāma, nor Mallagrāma Nandigrāma. This view of theirs concerns activity. Thus, verily, are established acts laid down in the Śruti and the Smṛti. (Thus the injunctions :) ' There shall be no recitation (of the sacred text) in the village ', and ' One shall not enter a village. ' Similarly other acts : ' Not after eating, not in a village (shall one recite) the *śukriya* Sāmans. ' There is no recitation within the surrounding wall, and (it is) that which they do not enter; they, however, do recite on the border and also enter it.

[5. 6]

Others think thus : The main expressive power (is) with reference to that which includes forest(s), boundary(ries) and hill(s). (A word expressive of) a whole, however, conveys the parts, viz. men, by a secondary expressive power, as in *pūrve pañcālāḥ* ' the Eastern Pañcāla. ' On this view the Bhāṣya : " This word *grāma* has a variety of meanings " does not agree with the final conclusion. Therefore his view is this : Just as the word *aśvaḥ*, both a nominal and a verbal, inflected word, without absolutely helping each other, proceeds to convey its own meaning, viz. an animal and an activity along with its means, similarly the word *grāma* also.

* * *

" (A speech sound) produced with mouth and nose jointly (is called) *anunāsika* (P. 1. 1. 8).

[1]

" What is this *mukhanāsikāvacanaḥ* ? " Whence (this) question ?—Thus he is thinking : The way this word is lettered, the exact meaning is not expressed.

Verily, meaning intended is this : What is uttered with mouth, with nose, that is (called) *anunāsika*. But the word as it stands (means) thus : *mukhanāsikam avacanam asya* 'that which is not uttered with mouth and nose.' Such being the case, neither the word befits the meaning, nor the meaning the word.

[1. 1]

" The lengthening will be there by the use of the readymade word ". This is the idea behind this (*Mbh*. statement) : It is not that the word which is otherwise in the world has been uttered in a lengthened form in grammar. But, rather, this itself is recommended in the world also. The correctness of (this word), which is recommended, is (here) sanctioned by way of (uttering) a ready-made form, as, e. g. by (reading) *sarvanāmāni* (P. 1. 1. 27). Otherwise, why should he use a long word ? *Mukhanāsikavacanam* cannot be there (as a correct form).

If, however, it is thus assumed : This original twofold form, which becomes due in the Dvandva compound, both in the *samāhāra* and the *iteretara* Dvandva, is superseded by the extension-of-oneness that is obligatory (in the case of *samāhāra*) ; that (twofold form) is again re-allowed by this (*Nipātana*) — then, (of course,) the twofold form can be there (as correct). Others, however, make only the neuter gender optional.

[1. 2]

... About this *mukhanāsikāvacana* ... (while) some hold the opposite view. In both (views, it is regarded that) the (part uttered by) nose brings about a (nasal) tinge in the part (of the nasal phoneme) which is uttered by the mouth. Just as in *sa\~yyantā*, *sa\~vvatsaraḥ* etc. a nasal in another phoneme brings about a (nasal) tinge, so that the phoneme *a* also appears as if it were nasal. There, however, the maxim of the Occupant-of-the-upper-floor is not (available). It is as in the case of Svarita (vowel) which, because of its division into parts, can neither be called Udātta, nor can it be called Anudātta. Its two parts (are) Udātta and Anudātta (respectively), but the whole is possessed of a different quality (i. e. accent) altogether, like *kalmāṣaḥ* 'grey', *sāraṅgaḥ* 'variegated'. The whole is not understood (by words expressive of parts).

It seems that Pāṇini read the word *mukha*- in the rule on this view. The author of Cūrṇi, however, not admitting a division (of a nasal phoneme) in parts, (regards) the whole phoneme as having a twofold place of articulation as in the case of (the words) *bhrāṣṭrapakva* and *ukhāpakva*. There what is uttered by mouth is also called uttered by nose, just as what is cooked in a

bhrāṣṭra is also said to be cooked in an *ukhā*. So on the maxim of the Occupant-of-the-upper-floor (the Cūrṇikāra) rejects the word *mukha*.

[1. 3]

" *āvacanam* means *īṣad vacanam* 'partly uttered' ". For that phoneme has its manifestation neither in the mouth alone, nor in the nose alone : But when another place of articulation is being struck by the wind with its power unexhausted at one (place of articulation) that phoneme finds its manifestation. There is some (or partly an) activity of the mouth and some of the nose. In this (view) also, since the common word (viz. *vacana*) is not ruled out, this word-form viz. *mukhanāsikavacana* is not ruled out. What is partly uttered is uttered all the same, just as what is whiter does not cease to be white; it *is* white. Or, what is somewhat away is away all the same.

[1. 4]

" Or, the nose, 'seconded' by the mouth, is its place of articulation " : The compound belongs to the category of *śākapārthivādi*. *Mukhadvitīyā* means *mukhasahāyā* 'accompanied or helped by the mouth;' just as in *asidvitīyo 'nusasāra* 'he followed with his sword'. There, in *mukhanāsikā vacanam asya* 'the mouth-nose is its place of articulation' the nose is called mouth by virtue of association. Here also the Dvandva compound is not prohibited on the pain of penalty. So the expression *mukhanāsikavacana* is not ruled out.

[1. 5]

" Or nose, connected with the mouth ". Some explain (this *Mbh*. thus). In the previous interpretation the deletion of the second constituent of the compound was not grammatically explained. Here, however, (it is) explained by (*Vār*. 4 on P. 2. 1. 34–35) : 'But (the purpose is) achieved (by teaching) in the domain of *samānādhikaraṇa* that (a compound with a nominal ending in) *kta* (as the second constituent and a nominal) in the Instrumental (as the first constituent forms a compound with a syntactically connected nominal) and there is a deletion of (the original) second constituent (ending in *kta*)'. But this is not correct, because the deletion is rejected there. Therefore, (what) he states by this (is) : This (phoneme) has a different place of articulation which is connected with the mouth and the nose. (It is) neither the mouth nor the nose. What then ? An intermediate point between the two. (It is) like the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā. In this (view) also the maxim of the Occupant-of-the-upper-floor is difficult to have because the place of articulation is different (from the two). — (Objection :) But in this interpretation the (feminine suffix) *ṅīp* should have been here because of its code

letter *ṭ* by P. 4. 1. 15 (thus the Sū. resulting into) : **mukha-nāsikāvacanīko 'nunāsikaḥ*. — (Reply :) This is no defect. (The word) *vacanam*, which is principal, is qualified by *mukhanāsikā*. And surely the principal does not take the gender of the subordinate. Hence *nāsikāvacanaḥ*. (It is) as in *viṁśatir gāvaḥ* 'twenty bulls / cows', in an expression where the qualified (word) is prominent ; nor even in *gavāṁ viṁśatiḥ* where qualifying (word) is dominant.

[2]

" Of the *yama*-s and the *anusvāra*-s only ". If this maxim is not there, there will certainly be a defect. Owing to the non-availability of the nearmost (phoneme), these *yama*-s and *anusvāra*-s alone will become due in the case of *āṅo 'nunāsikaḥ* ... (P. 6. 1. 126), *aṇo 'pragṛhyasyānunāsikaḥ* (P. 8. 4. 57) and *yaro 'nunāsike* ··· (P. 8. 4. 45). As to other (cases), *viḍvanor anunāsikasyāt* (P. 6. 4. 41) etc., there is just no possibility of *yama*-s and *anusvāra*-s. For they are never at the end of a verbal root. As to those, however, who read *yamānusvārāṇām api*, it is said that they have the maxim of the Resident-of-the-upper-floor in mind. In that case the nearmosts alone will be there (as substitutes) and not the *yama*-s and the *anusvāra*-s. (So) he will say : 'Neither harm, nor good'.

" (The name) will be due undesiredly for *k*, *c*, *ṭ*, *t* and *p* only '. In that case deletion (of the root-final) will be due undesiredly in *pakvam* by *anudāttopadeśa* ... (P. 6. 4. 37) ; (similarly) lengthening in *odanapak* 'one who cooks rice' by *anunāsikasya kvijhaloḥ* ... (P. 6. 4. 15).

" On the maxim of the Resident-of-the-upper-floor ". This maxim of the Resident-of-the-upper-floor applies to designations which are based on activity, not in the cases of conventional usage. Just as the designations, the Resident-of-the-upper-floor and the Resident-of-the-ground-floor are not based on mere conventional usage, and someone is called by both these designations because of the activity only, similarly in no grammar also *nāsikāvacana* 'uttered by nose' is taught as a technical term, nor is it (otherwise) well known. Even though uttered by both (organs) a phoneme gets the designation by reason of the activity only.

" Neither harm, nor good." Because of nearmostness, 'uttered by mouth' will realize into 'uttered by both (mouth and nose).'

[3]

" As regards (the objection about) mutual dependence, the reply is already given. " — Where ? — Where the name Vṛddhi (is taught). However, here it is given once more for the sake of demonstration. The name *anunāsika*

being known in the world like the names *saṁhitā* and *avasāna* should not be taught in grammar. If it is taught for enlightening the ignorant, the harm which is there has been already remedied.

* * *

" (A phoneme) which has a similar place of articulation and oral effort (as another is named its) *savarṇa* (homogeneous) " (P. 1. 1. 9).

[1]

If phonemes having a similar place of articulation and oral effort are mentioned in their own form in the rules for teaching an operation, the science of grammar becomes lengthy. Hence the coining of technical terms. Further, here he (Pat.) expresses the Dvandva, which presents itself first because of the favourable activity of (constituent) words as they are heard, when their form is grasped before their meaning is seen; or (he expresses) that compound (based) on whose meaning the Vārttika has been introduced (thus) :

[1. 1]

" *Tulyam* (is equivalent to) *tulayā sammitam* ' weighed by balance '; *āsyaprayatnam* (is to be analysed as) *āsyaṁ ca prayatnaś ca* ' *āsya* and *prayatna* ' ". Some put a figurative interpretation on *tulyam*, taking *tulya* in the sense ' like *tulya* '. But that is not proper... When the word *tulya* is uttered the meaning ' similar ' is understood uniformly everywhere. Further, where figurativeness (of meaning is there), the understanding does not take place without a meaningful context, connection with another word etc. Therefore, this is a conventional word ending in (the suffix) *yat*, a synonym of *sadṛśa*, *samāna* and *sadṛś*. (The word) *tulā* is brought in only in the process of derivation, because some word has to be postulated (as the stem). (Actually) there is neither a balance nor anything weighed. (It is) like (the words) *kuśala* ' clever ', *pravīṇa* ' expert ', *pratiloma* ' opposed ', *anuloma* ' favourable '.

[1. 2]

" Now, what is *āsya* ? " What do you consider as *āsya* ? The whole or the parts ? This is just an introduction to the presentation of the Vārttika.

" *Āsya* (is used) in the popular sense ". (It means that) it is known in the world. Just as (there are other popular words like) *paśu* ' beast ', *apatya* ' child ', *devatā* ' deity ', similarly *āsya*. In reply to the question ' But what is it that is known in the world ? ' (he) says : " From the lip upto the adam's apple. " *Kākalaka* (adam's apple) is the elevated spot in the throat.

" And why is *āsya* so called ? " The reason why (he) asks (this) (is) that it is not possible to decide merely on the strength of this (explanation). When it is said : " From the lip upto the adam's apple ", it is not known whether the regions (which are there) from the lip upto the adam's apple are understood (severally), or whether *āsya* as a whole (is understood). Some raise an objection (to this question) thus : (There is) a futility about this question regarding how (the word *āsya*) comes to have its meaning, since nothing is to be gained when the word *āsya* is understood etymologically. — (But) there *is* a utility. [To explain :] Does (this) word proceed (to convey meaning), based on a reason (viz. its derivation), or (is it) without any (such) basis, (proceeding merely on the strength of) its form, like *ḍittha* ? If it is assisted by the reason (viz. the derivation), then it will denote even a specific place of articulation and so there is nothing wrong. Thus, (others,) establishing the cause of the proceeding (of the word to convey a meaning), point out the reason for asking the question.

The other states the derivation : " *Āsya* is so called because with it they send out phonemes. " The *kṛtya* suffix is expressive of instrument, as in *snānīyaṁ cūrṇam* ' powder with which one bathes '. (It is) that with which they send out phonemes. Here by ' sending out ' is meant either manifestation or production. " *Varṇān* " : (By supplying this object) it is conveyed that a particular sending out, restricted to a particular context by usage (is intended).

" *Annam etad āsyandata iti āsyam iti vā.* " By this (he) says this : Or, the root *as* is (here) used in the meaning of the root *syand-*. Or, this is a form derived from *syand* itself preceded by the preverb ā(ṅ) with a suffix (*ḍ*)*a* following. *Anna* ' food ' has been brought in here for qualifying (with it) *syand*. By *etad* ' this ', *āsya* itself is intended, either as an agent or as an object. (So the intended idea is :) ' Having reached it (*āsya*), the food is liquified ' or ' this (*āsya*) *liquifies the food.* '

[1. 3]

" And now, what is *prayatna* ? " Is it making effort, or the beginning (of the effort) ? " (*Prayatna* is formed with) the word *na*, a *bhāvasādhana* after the root *yat-* preceded by *pra*. " The *bhāva* ' verbal abstract ' is a *sādhana* (i. e. a *kāraka*) on the view that the *kāraka*-s (are seven) with the *bhāva* as the seventh. Or, just as (the *kāraka*-s) *kartṛ* etc. bring about (an activity), similarly the *bhāva* also brings about the *kāraka*-s, since it is the basis of the application of the specific names (of the *kāraka*-s). — Even so, how is the word *na* brought about by the *bhāva* ? — The word *sādhana* does not mean what brings about (something). What then ? It means what is denoted. Or,

bhāva is admitted by some in the capacity of *sādhana*. The inner *bhāva*, which is denoted by the verbal root, has no basis and is unnamable and so the *bhāva* which is denoted by the suffix (*-na*) is accepted as a *sādhana* as it has a finished form. (It is) as in the case of (the word) *vānaspatya* ' a collection of plants ' where one and the same whole, looked upon as either different from or identical with (the constituents) becomes both as a meaning of the stem and as that of the suffix. And that *bhāva*, having become current with one property here and another there, is (here) admitted as the related one, being expressed by the word *na*.

[1. 4]

" What (is the object) in reading *āsya* ? " — Phonemes are produced in the *nāsikā* also. The word *āsya* may have been read in order to exclude them. — (Reply :) They are produced in the *āsya* itself. *Nāsikā* is just *anunāsa*, That is one view. Others think (thus) : This is not the *nāsikā*. Which then ? Within the mouth there is skin which is stretched like the hide of a drum. A line connected with it is the *nāsikā*. When it is struck by the wind it becomes the cause of a particular sound. The place of articulation of *a* is outside (the *āsya*). He will, of course, raise an objection about it. According to some the Visarga is produced at the *uras*. No purpose is served whether it has a homogeneity or not (with another phoneme). " He will say it (later) that the reading of *āsya* is by way of a qualification of *prayatna*. " (He) says this : Now is not the time for examining it. (Instead) we shall examine something else first. This one we shall examine at a later time.

[2]

" There (will be) an over-extension of the name ' homogeneous ' to (the phonemes) having different places of articulation " (*Vār*. 1). Verily, effort cannot be qualified by mouth on the Dvandva (alternative). So the name homogeneous becomes due for *j*, *b*, *g*, *ḍ*, *d* having different places of articulation because their inner effort, *spṛṣṭatā* ' contact ' etc. is similar, according to (the statement) : ' *spṛṣṭa* (contact) is the effect of the stops '. Thereupon, when mutual homogeneity is there, deletion (of preceding homogeneous consonants : *p* and *g*) becomes due in *tarptā*, *ūrgjaḥ*, *ūrgjyaḥ* by *jharo jhari savarṇe* (P. 8. 4. 65).

[2. 1]

" (The object) is achieved by (reading the rule as) ' (A phoneme) which has a similar oral place of articulation and a similar oral effort (with another is called its) ' homogeneous ' '. The name will not take place (for *j*, *b*. etc..). —

" Even so, what is the object in reading *āsya* ' the mouth ", since the places are within the mouth itself ? " (It is) a qualification of the effort ". The other (desputant) (holds) that *āsya* has been included (in the definition) in order to make that a qualification for (the effort) which is within the mouth, and not external. A (consonant) belonging to a particular class is desired to be termed ' homogeneous ' with another belonging to (that) class. But they have different efforts from one another. In that case there will be no name ' homogeneous ' with one another for them. Therefore, by reason of the reading *āsya* only four internal (efforts) are considered for application and non-application of the name ' homogeneous '. The externals, on the other hand, are excluded. (He) mentions those external (efforts) by " *saṁvāra* and *vivāra* " etc. How these are external is shown in detail in the *Śikṣā*.

[2. 2]

" Even so the name ' homogeneous ' is not available for the phoneme *a*, for the place of articulation of *a* is outside the mouth ". The region which is below the adam's apple and near the collar bone is the place of articulation of *a*. And that is outside the mouth. — (Objection :) But it was said that the reading of *āsya* is for qualifying the effort. And the effort of the phoneme *a* is internal. — This is what he thinks : Of that whose place is external, the effort also is external. Or, even the place also is external and so the reading of *āsya* can be a qualification of place. So (there is) no defect.

" Some favour *a* as having the entire mouth for its place ". The entire mouth becomes active in the articulation of (this) phoneme. So externality of place is not possible on this phonological view. The name ' homogeneous ' is not there for *a* and *h* and so the rule *nājjhalau* (P. 1. 1. 10) need not be read.

" Even so, the designation ' (phonemes) whose place in the mouth is similar ' is not fit ". If (for *a*) the whole mouth is the place what other region can be named either as the (thing) contained or as the container ? " The designation takes place by the extension of the status of one having a designation ". A distinction is made by assuming (the relation of) a whole and parts, by looking upon as the whole the mouth which concerns another phoneme, that which concerns the activity of articulation, and that which concerns the phoneme *a* and by understanding that in it the mouth concerned with the phoneme *a* is similar. Or a word aims at a part : some (word) conveys the mouth in a general way, another in some particular way and so the difference will be there.

[2. 3]

" The *āsya* is not the popular one ". — But surely even *āsya* ending in the Taddhita suffix is a popular one ! — This (is what) he says : The *āsya*

which ends in the suffix, which is understood by the auditory perception, is not resorted here. " The place and the *karaṇa* ". The place (means) velum etc. *Karaṇa* according to some (means) close contact etc., according to others the tip, the part near the tip, the centre, and the root of the tongue. — If so, what is the purpose of reading *prayatna* 'effort' (in the rule)? Let (the rule) be this much : *tulyāsyaṁ savarṇam* '(A phoneme) which has the *āsya* (i. e. a place and a *karaṇa*) similar (with another, is called) 'homogeneous' (with it)'. (For) only this much is there in the *āsya*, (viz.) place and effort. — The inclusion of both is for excluding the activity of (only) each single one... such being the case the same defect (is there) — the name 'homogeneous' becomes due for *j, b, g, ḍ, d* which have a similar effort and which are differentiated in the matter of place (?).

" Even so the effort remains unqualified ". 'By the *āsya*' is understood. As a result the external efforts remain unexcluded.

[2. 4]

" The effort also is qualified. ... *Prayatna* (means) the initial effort ". This is the view of the author of the Bhāṣya : The close contact etc. (take place) first, afterwards the openness etc. of the breath when it is hit back at the root of the palate.

" These two *a*-sounds are merged ". Just as a drop of milk, merged in a jar of water, is not perceived, similarly the phoneme *a*. Others explain : by *praśliṣṭāv avarṇau* is meant *saṁvṛtāv avarṇau* 'two close *a*-sounds'.

" Well, then, between the phoneme *a* and *ai/au* ". This is the idea : these two *a*-sounds are separate. Such being the case, in *nāvyam, naubhūtam* and *nauyati* there will be elision (of *a*) and (the substitution of) *ī*.

" Well, then, between these two themselves ". (*Etayoḥ* means) of the phonemes *ai* and *au*. — But what will be (the harm)? — By the rule *eta ai* (P. 3. 4. 93) even the phoneme *au* will become due undesiredly. — If only (the Paribhāṣā) *bhāvyamānena savarṇagrahaṇaṁ na* (19) is not there.

" *Udātta* etc. are not distinctive ". It is taught by indication that these do not operate distinctively in grammar.

[2. 5]

" We will resort to what is common ". Although there is a difference of effort between the first and the second, and between the third and the fourth, still resorting to the common effort the name 'homogeneous' will operate.

" What ? Even when there is difference ? " This is the idea : If (the name) operates when similarity of close contact is there, in spite of the difference of *vivāra*, then (the name) becomes due because of similarity of *vivāra*, in spite of the difference of close contact etc. " If (the name were to operate) where everything is similar ". (He) would have said this much (only) : '*ako 'ki dīrghaḥ*', '*jharo jhari*'. Even when the word *savarṇa* is read, there will not be elision (of *ḍ*) in *śiṇḍhi, piṇḍhi* as everything is not the same. So (he) says : " The name ' homogeneous ' should be there where there is difference ".

" Of *ś* and *ch*, of *ṣ* and *ṭh*, of *s* and *th* ". Everything is similar, viz. being voiceless and being aspirate. Only the manner of articulation is different. Some are close while others are open. And when the name ' homogeneous ' is there elision becomes due in *niśśchadma, niṣṣṭhuram, nissthānam* by *jharo jhari savarṇe* (P. 8. 4. 65).

[2. 6]

" Well, then, this is a Bahuvrīhi of three constituents thus : *tulya āsye prayatna eṣām* ' those whose effort in the mouth is similar '." The Bahuvrīhi of even non-coreferential (constituents) is accepted on the strength of usage. — (Objection :) But then *āsya* is not qualified by *tulya*, since the two have two different case endings and also because (*āsya*) does not have the status of the principal. — This is no defect. When a support is accepted for a thing to be supported, then from the commonness of the thing to be supported (among two entities) is implied the commonness (of the support itself). Just as, when a similar food in Madhurā for Devadatta and Yajñadatta is spoken of it is understood that Madhurā also is common to both. Similarly here also, *āsya* also is common to the two phonemes whose effort in the *āsya* is similar. Or, by reason of the force of understanding *āsya* as a word ending in a Taddhita suffix.

" Or, the first (is) Tatpuruṣa, then the Bahuvrīhi ". By what authority (is) the Tatpuruṣa (formed) ? If by the use of the finished word, then the compound will be (justified), but not as the Tatpuruṣa compound. Therefore, by separating *saptamī* (in P. 2. 1. 40), (the compound may be called) Tatpuruṣa. (There is) no first position (for *āsya-*) by reason of the use of the finished word. Or, this (is just) a statement of the meaning (when it is said) " same in the *āsya* ". The [effort] which is there at the place of articulation gets the designation *āsya* ; (This word) *āsya*, in Nominative, forms a compound (with *tulya*) because of association by *kṛtyatulyākhyā ajātyā* (P. 2. 1. 68).

[3]

" Of it ". " But it should be said ; ' of it ' ". This is (only) an indication of the meaning and not (the exact) text. The text should be so read

as this meaning will become available. It should be clearly statedt here that 'a (phoneme) whose place of articulation and effort are common with another, it is 'homogeneous' with it'. Or it should be stated (thus) : 'that (phoneme) whose place of articulation and effort are common, is 'homogeneous' with it'. *yasya ... yad* 'of which' ... 'that' will be understood automatically. Otherwise, (once) the name 'homogeneous' is obtained (by some phoneme) because of the similarity of place of articulation and effort (with any other phoneme), then in the case of operation-teaching rules, (e. g. in) *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101) — where (the restriction) of mutual similarity of place of articulation and effort is not there (necessary) for the preceding one (to become long) before the other — the long substitute proceeds (for the preceding *ak*) when (a phoneme) homogeneous with any phoneme whatsover follows. If it is asked : why is the Sūtra (then) framed at all? — (the reply is :) for ruling out *r* and the *ūṣman* (from the operation of the name *savarṇa*). These do not have similarity of effort (with any other phoneme) (as follows) from [the *Mbh.*] '*Repha* and the *ūṣman*-s have no homogeneous phonemes' (I. 28. 12).

[3. 1]

"*Tasyāvacanam*". This is not a compound. It means that there should not be a statement of the word which has been uttered by you. Or, *tasya* is a quoted word. There should not be a statement of it. Why? "Because of the authoritativeness of the statement". (Objection :) But it has been said (by me) that it is for ruling out *r* and the *ūṣman*-s. — That is wrong. Even they are mutually homogeneous, (one) *r* with another *r* and (one) *ūṣman* with another *ūṣman*. Or, had this been the object, he would have effected the ruling out of *r* and the *ūsman*-s in the rules where the term *savarṇa* occurs.

[3. 2]

"Or, this is similar to relative words" (*Vār*. 4). "One should respect the mother. One should attend upon the father." The word *mātṛ* is not used in the world to rule out barrenness or the word *pitṛ* to rule out impotency. What then? This is the very nature of this (word) that it proceeds, having the expectation of one's offspring only. "The one who is somebody's mother and the one who is somebody's father". Similarly the word *tulya* is just of this kind in the world. When it is said that the daughter should be given away (in marriage) to an equal one, a Brāhmaṇa does not give away his daughter to somebody who is an equal one of a Caṇḍāla. What then? (To one who is an equal) of himself. When it is said that there is a long (substitute) when a homogeneous (phoneme) follows, what is (really) said is that there is a long (substitute) for an *ak* (phoneme) when a vowel which has a similar place of articulation and effort

follows. When such is the case, since the word *tulya* has a similar nature, even in the absence of *tasya* the same meaning is obtained.

[4]

" The *savarṇa* rule for the phonemes *ṛ* and *ḷ* (*Vār*. 5) ". (*Savarṇavidhi* means) rule (teaching) an operation based on (the name) ' homogeneous '. Or, the name should be taught because, between the two, teaching of the name is a shorter (procedure). Therefore (Pat.) says : ' The name should be taught '. — Now, in the absence of a relative word, how is it known that the name ' homogeneous ' belongs to these two mutually, and not these two on the one hand and (some) other phonemes on the other ? Such being the case, either the word *mithaḥ* ' mutually ' should be added or (it should be explained) that *ṛkāraḷkārayoḥ savarṇavidhiḥ* is not the text of a rule. What is it then ? An indication (of the intended idea). The rule should be framed in such a way that the name ' homogeneous ' becomes mutual.

" So that there will be a substitution of a homogeneous long (vowel) in *hotṛ ḷkāraḥ, hotṝkāraḥ* ". There is Genitive of relationship in *hotuḥ ḷkāraḥ śobhanaḥ* ' the phoneme *ḷ* of (i. e. uttered by) the *hotṛ* is lovely '. So this is a compound.

" This cannot be a purpose. (The author of the Vārttikas) will say : ' In the matter of a long substitute (which takes place) before a homogeneous (vowel), [it should be stated that optionally (*r*)*ṛ* (is the substitute) when short *ṛ* follows ', ' it should be stated that optionally (*l*)*ḷ* (is the substitute) when *ḷ* follows '] ". (He) is thinking thus : (The word) *dīrghaḥ* is there (continued). Therefore, when (*r*)*ṛ* is made (an) optional (substitute), and similarly (*l*)*ḷ*, there will be a long substitute (for both originals) when *ḷ* follows. There are no long (varieties) of *ḷ* and there is no long (vowel) which will favour both. Therefore, *ṛ* alone will be able (to come in as a substitute) when *ḷ* follows.

" That may be (meant to apply) where a homogeneous (phoneme) follows ". If that (i. e. the rule *ḷti* (*l*)*ḷ vā*) is made without laying down the name *savarṇa*, then it will mean ' *ak* is replaced by *ḷ* ' and so ((*l*)*ḷ* will be the substitute) for any *ak*. (It will be there where it is not desired, as e. g.) in *dadhy ḷkāraḥ, madhv ḷkāraḥ*. Therefore the name *savarṇa* must be laid down.

" As for this (word) *ṛti* ' when *ṛ* follows ' I shall read (in its place) *ṛtaḥ* ' after *ṛ* '." With the (new) rule : ' There is an optional substitute (*r*)*ṛ* when a (phoneme) homogeneous with *ṛ* follows it ' the substitute will be there only when *ṛ* follows. " Then *ḷti* ' when *ḷ* follows ' ". This rule is framed for non-homogeneous (phonemes). Therefore (there are) three forms when the phoneme

ṛ follows : one in the context of absence of euphonic combination, two in the context of euphonic combination. Similarly when ḷ follows.

" That need not be said ". (He) is thinking thus : Both of these, *r*(ṛ) and (*l*)ḷ, are long; they will take place. When ṛ follows, (there will be) homogeneous (ṝ) ; when ḷ follows, ṝ and *l*(ḷ) (will be the substitutes), if the name *savarṇa* is there.

" That has to be said of necessity. ' An *ac* which has a duration of either *u*, *ū* or *ū*3 (i. e. one, two or three (or more than three) moras respectively) is named *hrasva* ' short ', *dīrgha* ' long ' and *pluta* ' prolated ' respectively ' (P. 1. 2. 27); and this is not *ac* ". — Whence the absence of *ac*-status ? — Some think : (There are,) (in the substitute taught by the *Vār*.) two half *r* sounds and a vocalic mora. They think that here is a difference in effort because of the ' slight contact ' (in the case of these two sounds). Others say : (there are) two quarter *r* sounds and a vocalic mora. Yet some others think : (there is) a full *r* sound and a ṛ sound and a vocalic element of half a mora. But this one is more closed, (while) ṛ is open. Therefore it cannot be comprehended by ṛ. If so —

" I shall declare the *ac*-status ". When *ac*-status is there the name ' long ' will be available. For one, however, whose view (is) that this (sound) consists of two and a half moras, for him, (even) if *ac*-status is there (in this way), the name ' long ' will not be there because of difference in duration. Therefore this should be regarded as consisting of two moras. " That has to be necessarily declared " even by you who read (the additional rule) : (*r*)ṛ *vā*. How ? This much (viz. the substitution of (*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ), for that matter, will be (available) because of the statement. But it will be difficult to substitute a pluta in its place. Verily a pluta (substitute) for these two is taught (? desired). And whichever is made (substitute), even that cannot be (replaced by) a pluta because of absence of *ac*-status. There is neither an original nor a substitute. The position therefore is that the one who lays down the name ' homogeneous ' and the one who reads *l*(ḷ) *vā* in the matter of the long homogeneous euphony, both of them have to declare *ac*-status (for (*r*)ṛ and *l*(ḷ)).

" Well ! Which is better ? " Laying down of the term ' homogeneous ', or (making the rule) *ḷ-vāvacanam* ? — (Objection :) (The question) ' Well ! Which is better ? ' is reasonable if the activity of two rules is the same with reference to the word to be derived. Here this activity, however, is quite different. How ? If the term ' homogeneous ' is laid down (and) *ṛti ṛvāvacanam* is not said, (then) in the position *hotṛ* + *ṛkāra* two long ṛ-s present themselves; (here) both the originals, viz. ṛ-s, have each a *r* in each. So, since the two originals contain two *r*-s, therefore if the substitute has to be one with

two *r*-s the long two-*r* (substitute) (i. e. (*r*)*ṛ*) alone (lit. always) presents itself. And, (further,) if it is held that ((*r*)*ṛ* is) more close, then how can (a phoneme which is) more close be a substitute for open (phonemes)? So an open alone (lit. always) has to be the substitute. Similarly, when the phoneme *ḷ* follows, there is no long (phoneme) containing (both) *r* and *l*; therefore, alternately there will be sometimes a long (*ṝ*) substitute and sometimes a long (*l*)*ḷ*. And if you think that these forms are to be established and they can be established in this way — (No.!) It is not (so). The three forms may be established when the phonemes are different, i. e. *ṛ* and *ḷ*, but not the other (i. e. identical like *ḷ* + *ḷ*). — What about him who lays down (the substitute) (*l*)*ḷ*? — He, while laying down (*l*)*ḷ* optionally, lays down a long (substitute) also optionally and also (*l*)*ḷ*.

But even for him who lays down the term 'homogeneous' the phoneme *ḷ* is at hand (as *sthānin*) in the situation *ṛ* + *ṛ*, and the phoneme *ṛ* (will be available) in the situation *ḷ* + *ḷ*. Such being the case, all the three forms will be available in each of the two cases. Perhaps it may be (said by way of objection) that (in that case) the separate statement becomes superfluous, the intention being to prevent the (resulting into) of three forms on one alternative on the strength of the separate statements. (Reply:) the (three forms) do become available in any one of the two situations.

"I shall state the *l*-suffixion (for *aṇ* in the place) of *ḷ*". 'I shall interpret' — that (is the intended) meaning. How? The phoneme *a* which follows *l* in the Pratyāhāra Sūtras °*raṭ* / *laṇ* / — that will be declared as nasal. Therefore with that (*ã*) as its final, the initial *r* will be a name of the intermediate (i. e. *l*) by *ādir antyena sahetā* (P. 1. 1. 71). Therefore *r* in *ur aṇ raparaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 51) conveys the phoneme *l* which is intermediate. — Even so, why do (both) *r* and *l* not follow *aṇ* that replaces both? — Because of nearmostness. Just as the potential *jaś* phonemes are replaced by *jaś* ones, and the potential *car* phonemes are replaced by *car* ones, similarly (there is) a substitute with *r* for an original with *r*, and a substitute with *l* for an original with *l*.

["*Praklpyamānam iti.*"] Just as cerebralisation of *n* becomes (due) in *kḷpyamānam*, it similarly becomes due in *prakḷpyamānaṁ paśya* by *kṛty acaḥ* (P. 8. 4. 29). "With three middle (classes of consonants)". What is the difference? In the earlier (explanation), the phoneme *ṣ* is inferred (to be not included in *śar*) on the strength (of P. 8. 4. 1), since it is a cause of cerebralisation of *n*. Here, in "*laśasaiś ca*" only *ś* and *s*, which cause intervention, are mentioned. — (Objection:) Even when intervention by the phoneme *l* is mentioned, (the prohibition) is not available since this (*ḷ*) in *prakḷpyamāna* is not *l*. So (by way of reply he) says; "Parts of phonemes are comprehended

when phonemes are mentioned.'' Even when a whole is active, (its) part also is active, because its activity is not destroyed. — " If so, there is no purpose in (suggesting additional) mention of *ṛ* (in P. 8. 4. 1) which teaches cerebralisation of *n* after *r* and *ṣ*. " Cerebralisation of *n* will take place because of *r* (in *ṛ*) itself. When this is the case there is no mention of the phoneme *ṛ* (in P. 8. 4. 1), and then how can (this *ṛ*), which is not mentioned (in the rule), comprehend the phoneme *ḷ* ? The term ' homogeneous ' thus stands.

When this is the case, the reading of the phoneme *ḷ* in the Akṣarasamāmnāya is superfluous. (Further,) what (operation) is taught for a (root) having a code-letter *ṛ* will become due for a (root) having a code-letter *ḷ* also. [— It is not so. If confusion were to result, use of a separate code-letter (viz. *ḷ*) would be superfluous.] — It will not be [superfluous]. The furnishing of the code-letter *ḷ* will be for (indicating an Aorist marker) *aṅ*. Therefore, the phoneme *ḷ* has to be read in the Akṣarasamāmnāya. When it is thus read, there will be the removal of the difficulty on the strength of the use of a separate code-letter.

* * *

[1]

" *ac* and *hal* (phonemes) (are) not (named ' homogeneous ' with one another) " (P. 1. 1. 10).

The place of articulation and the manner of articulation of the phonemes *i* and *ś*, and of the phonemes *a* and *h* being the same (the name ' homogenous ' applies to them undesiredly). Therefore the prohibition of the name ' homogeneous ' is stated (thus) : ' *ac* and *hal* (phonemes) are not named ' homogeneous '. When things stand thus, this is stated (by the author of the Vārttikas) —

" When the prohibition (of homogeneity) between *ac* and *hal* phonemes is there, (there results) a prohibition between two *ś* phonemes because of their *ac*-status and *hal*-status " (*Vār.* 1). Since the two, *ac* and *hal*, cannot be prohibited on the ground of their *ac*-status and *hal*-status what is to be understood as prohibited is their property under discussion. And which is that property ? The designation ' homogeneous '. Or, by *pratiṣedha*, recession is meant. (So *ajjhaloḥ pratiṣedhe* means) *ajjhaloḥ savarṇasaṁjñāto nivṛttau* ' when there is a recession of *ac* and *hal* from the designation ' homogeneous '. The expression *śakārapratiṣedhaḥ* is also interpreted in two ways : (1) Prohibition (of homogeneousness) of the phoneme *ś* becomes due (undesirably); something should be done (to prevent it). Or, (2) as to this prohibition (of *sāvarṇya*) between *ac* and *hal* (phonemes), the phoneme *ś* should be prohibited (i. e. excluded from the operation of this rule). Even though the compound (*śakāra-*

pratiṣedha) (is formed with *śakāra*) in singular, still it is understood in a particular way (i. e. with *śakāra* in dual) on the strength of the fact that the name *savarṇa* ' homogeneous ' is based on separateness (i. e. two entities).

" For, the phoneme *ś* is certainly *ac*, and also *hal* ". Its *hal* status is of course known from the alphabet. It is the *ac*-status which is difficult to justify. So he asks a question about the *ac*-status only : " How, to begin with, the *ac*-status ? " The other one justifies the *ac*-status (thus) : The phoneme *i* comprehends the phoneme *ś* also by ' the comprehension of the homogeneous '. *Savarṇagrahaṇena* means *savarṇagṛhītyā* ' by the comprehension of the homogeneous '; or ' by the rule ' (P. 1. 1. 69). Such being the case, just as the phoneme *i* receives the operations taught for *ac*, similarly *ś* also. In this way there is *ac*-status (for *ś*).

[1. 1]

But how does the phoneme *i* comprehend the phoneme *ś*, since there is this prohibition here, viz. *nājjhalau* (P. 1. 1. 10) ?

[1. 1. 1]

Here is the reply : This part of this prohibitory rule, viz. *ac* — is it (a name of the phonemes from *a* up to *c*) inclusive of their homogeneous phonemes or not ? Let us discuss this. — Well, it seems reasonable that (*ac* is a name of the phonemes from *a* up to *c*) inclusive of their homogeneous phonemes as in *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101). — But with reference to this *sūtra* (P. 1. 1. 10) there is no comprehension (of the homogeneous) taught by *aṇ udit savarṇasya cāpratyayaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 69). What is the reason ? Because of the still incompleteness of the relationship of the name and the named. Comprehension (results) from homogeneousness. In the absence of homogeneousness there is no comprehension (in P. 1. 1. 10), because the rule of comprehension of the homogeneous is yet incomplete, because there is no other comprehension-sanctioning (rule), and because there cannot be any action upon oneself. As regards (the word) *ac* there (in P. 1. 1. 10) the rule which teaches comprehension (of the homogeneous) is yet incomplete since the relationship of the name and the named is still in formation. Also, there is no other comprehension-sactioning (rule). Also, further, action upon oneself is self-contradiction. It is like a jar which cannot touch itself. That is why it is said under *hal antyam* (P. 1. 3. 3) : ' The expression *hal* is not established, since the status of code-letter is not made known in the case of the phoneme *l* ' (*Vār*. 3). To explain : With regard to this expression *hal*, it cannot teach the name *it* for the phoneme *l* (in *hal*), since action upon one-self is self-contradiction. Therefore the name *it* should be taught separately for the phoneme *l*. It is further said there : ' But

(the goal) is achieved because of the reading of the phoneme *l*' (*Vār.* 4), ' or by (resorting to) a single-remainder mode of expression' (*Vār.* 5).

[1. 1. 2]

And just as there is no comprehension (of the homogeneous) by the expression *ac* (in P. 1. 1. 10), similarly in the matter of prohibition (P. 1. 1. 10), there is no prohibition (of comprehension of the homogeneous), because of the incompleteness of the prohibitory rule; because of the absence of any other prohibitory rule; and because action upon oneself is self-contradictory. The prohibition *nājjhalau* is yet incomplete with reference to this abbreviation *ac*. And there is no other prohibitory rule. And action upon oneself is self-contradiction, like the touching of the jar (by the jar itself). Such being the case, just as (the sentence) ' do not make a noise (*śabda*) ' cannot prohibit this *śabda* itself (i. e. the one mentioned in this sentence) — what then ? — but (it prohibits) other *śabda*-s, similarly in the present prohibitory rule it is impossible to make a prohibition. Just as the name ' homogeneous ' is not prohibited for the phoneme *i* and *ś*, similarly between two *ś* sounds (= secondary *i* + *ś*) also. Just as in *kumārī śete* ' the girl lies ', there is no prohibition of the name ' homogeneous ' between *ī* and a following *ś*.

[1. 2]

(Objection :) ' A general rule proceeds, having first ascertained (and so having avoided) the domain of the exception '. So the name ' homogeneous ' establishes itself, excluding the domain of the prohibition. Whence then the comprehension (of *ś* by *i*) ? — (Reply :) True. It is so, only if an exception is there. But it has been already said that it is not there, as the prohibition is not yet accomplished. And if there is no domain of exception, the name homogeneous is bound to proceed, and so also the comprehension of it (i. e. of *savarṇa*) which follows from it. Since in this abbreviation the phoneme *ś* is comprehended as an *ac*, elsewhere the comprehension of the homogeneous (*ac* and *hal*) is not there. So he says : " Such being the case there is a difficulty in the case of the elision of a homogeneous ". He thus states the difficulty in the context of the particular environment : Non-availability of the elision of the homogeneous in the field of the elision of the homogeneous (is the resulting) defect. " *Paraśśatāni kāryāṇi* " (means) (things) which aught to be done, going beyond a hundred, more than a hundred. The compound (is formed) by splitting away *pañcamī* from P. 2. 1. 37 ; or by *sādhanaṁ kṛtā* (P. 2. 1. 33, *Vār.* 2). The shifiting to the following position (of *śata*) (is to be accounted for by considering the compound) as belonging to the *rājadanta* class (P. 2. 2. 31). (The word *śata* has formed) a compound with the word *para*; or (there is here) the word *paras* having the

meaning of *para*. (If with *para*) an augment *s*(*uṭ*) should be seen here by regarding it as belonging to the *pāraskara* class (P. 6. 1. 157). In this position (or, after *suṭ* is brought in), after the palatalisation of *s* (and) reduplication (of *ś*), (the form) with three *ś*-s (alone) will be available on account of the prohibition of homogeneity. This is the defect.

[1. 3]

Here (some) raise a question : If the phoneme *ś*, comprehended by the phoneme *i* (becomes) *ac*, and as such receives an operation (taught) for an *ac*, viz. the prohibition (of homogeneity with *hal*) (then) similarly why does it not receive this one also : ' A *śar* is not reduplicated when an *ac* follows (P. 8. 4. 49) ', ' (a *yar* following an *ac*) is optionally reduplicated, but not when an *ac* follows it (P. 8. 4. 47) ? ' Will not the reduplication (in *paraśśata*) also then be prohibited by it ? They (then) give the following solution : *anaci ca* (P. 8. 4. 47) is a negation by way of exclusion; (*anaci*) means ' when (a phoneme) other than an *ac* follows. And (they add) this (*ś*) is other than *ac*. —

(But) this is wrong. It cannot be so argued in the case of names. Here the phoneme *ś* is both a *hal* and also an *ac*. So if (*anaci* is interpreted as meaning) ' when (a phoneme) other than an *ac* follows ', will *ś* be excluded (from *ac*) or not excluded ? Undoubtedly it will not be excluded ... When (it is said) : ' Let those who do not live on upper floor be brought ', will one who lives on both (the ground and the upperfloors) be brought because he lives on the ground floor (also), or will he not be brought because it is not possible to call him ' other than an upperfloor-dweller ' since he lives on the upper floor (also) ? Similarly, (there are injunctions :) ' One should sacrifice a non-black (goat) ', ' One should sacrifice a non-white (goat) '; should a variegated goat be sacrificed or be not sacrificed ? He should not be sacrificed.

But, then, in this way (? But, even so) (a form) with three *ś* phonemes is quite legitimate. — How ? — It is already said (above) that ' There is no prohibition (of homogeneity) in (this) prohibitory rule because this prohibition is not yet accomplished. In the abbreviated name used elsewhere, there certainly is (this) prohibition '. So how can this (*ś*) have an *ac*-status in the matter of reduplication ? Therefore, with reference to this such measure is to be taken as a result of which the phoneme *i* will not comprehend the phoneme *ś* in this abbreviated name (i. e. *ac* in P. 1. 1. 10). For, if once (this) comprehension is there, it is obvious that there is a comprehension of the phoneme *ś* (in this abbeviated name) elsewhere (also). This (argument) has been advanced on the understanding that this (negation in P. 1. 1. 10) is a negation by way of prohibition. And it is with this idea that the *Vār*. has been read : *ajjhaloḥ*

pratiṣedha ... etc. He has used *pratiṣedha* for *prasajyapratiṣedha*. For, if this were a negation by way of exclusion, then there would be no rule (P. 1. 1. 9) which would have taught mutual homogeneity of *ac* and *hal* and no prohibition (P. 1. 1. 10) also (would be neeessary). (The resultant position would have been) that excluding the mutuality of *ac* and *hal*, there is homogeneity between *ac*-s, and (homogeneity) between *hal*-s. There would have been no defect then.

[2]

" (The object is) achieved on account of the absence of *ac*-status ". There is no homogeneity, because of the difference of effort within the mouth. When it (*ac*-status) is not there what is the object in prohibiting it ? Thus the remedy is stated in the form of the rejection of the Sūtra. But the way the Pāṇinīyas read, *īṣat* ' slightly ' is either continued in both (*ūṣman* and vowels) or discontinued in both. So (he) states (another) remedy.

[2. 1]

" Or, because of the incompleteness of the sentence " there is no comprehension. This sentence, viz. *aṇ udit savarṇasya ca* (P. 1. 1. 69) is stated to be incomplete because of the incompleteness of (its) meaning. — But whence the incompleteness of it (the meaning) ? — Because of want of knowledge of the two limbs. These two are the limbs of (this) sentence : (one) *aṇ* and (the other) *savarṇasya* ' of the homogeneous '. When they become known : ' this is *aṇ* ', ' this is *savarṇa* ', then the comprehension (takes place). Such being the case this (P. 1. 1. 69) does not occupy itself with the activity of comprehension in the matter of the alphabet, the name *it* ' code-letter ', and the *pratyāhāra* ' abbreviated name '. In (the very rule) *aṇ udit savarṇasya ca* (P. 1. 1. 69) where the form *aṇ* is uttered, even there there is no comprehension ; what to say then where these, forms (which are) a means for it (are uttered) ? (Surely) these are not homogeneous at the time of (the utterance of) the alphabet !

" (Then) the name ' homogeneous ' which belongs to a time subsequent to the abbreviated name. " Here the sequential order of the text is not intended. What then ? The sequential order of the (rule) application (i. e.) the sequential order as regards (the ascertaining of) *aṇ* and the ' homogeneous '. There, just as in the case of the alphabet etc. the form is not accomplished and so there is no comprehension, similarly there ought not to be comprehension as long as a homogeneous is not ascertained. When the name ' homogeneous ' is ascertained by the general rule and its exception, only then (*aṇ*) can comprehend on account of the homogeneity (of the phonemes concerned) when elsewhere the name *ac* is

used. This being so, here (in P. 1. 1. 10) there is neither comprehension nor prohibition (of *sāvarṇya*). And since here neither the phoneme *ī* nor the phoneme *ś* is comprehended, the name 'homogeneous' is not prohibited between the phoneme *ī* and the phoneme *ś*. As there is homogeneity between the phoneme *ī* and the phoneme *ś* on account of a common (place of articulation and the effort), a single (long) substitute, caused by homogeneity, becomes due in *kumārī śete*. It is made to recede by the continuation of *aci*.

[2. 2]

"In that case, then, just as the phoneme *i* does not comprehend the phoneme *ś*, similarly it may not comprehend the phoneme *ī* also." He is thinking that wherever the word *savarṇa* 'homogeneous' is uttered, there is a vicious circle everywhere there. (But as a matter of fact) comprehension is not there only in the teaching of phoneme (i. e. the alphabet) etc. For these latter are resorted to for the sake of this (P. 1. 1. 69). Just as in the stage of potsherds there is no jar itself; whence (then) any particular function on its part? As to the operational rules (like) *akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101), they are not for this one (P. 1. 1. 69); on the contrary this one itself is for their sake. Why will the comprehension then not take place? So by this means he says this: in this domain there is comprehension, in this domain there is no comprehension.

[2. 3]

"Another says." (In this alternative interpretation) everything is the same. The difference, however, consists only in this much: Absence of *ac*-status is the cause of accomplishment (of the desired goal), (and) incompleteness of the sentence is the reason for the absence of the *ac*-status. But since here the goals being different the optionality of reasons is not justified, he says: "On this alternative *vā* 'or' is not justified. — This too is justified." The idea is that (an unsaid) remainder of the sentence will be resorted to for the sake of an alternative enunciation: Either (the goal) is achieved because of the absence of the *ac*-status owing to the incompleteness of the sentence or (it does not matter) even if there is comprehension of the phoneme *ś* by the phoneme *i*.

"But it makes a difference." This is said on the understanding that there is a difference in the auditory perception. "The reduplication is optional". The rule (P. 8. 4. 45): *yaro 'nunāsike 'nunāsiko vā* is there (by continuation). "How cannot there be this difference?" The meaning is that there is difference. The other one says: "If the elision were obligatory" there would be difference. "But that elision is optional." The rule (P. 8. 4. 62): *jhayo ho 'nyatarasyām* is there (by continuation). If it is so, then the Grammar is settled in such a way that there is identity (of view) between you and me.

Interpretation of others : "How cannot this difference (be there) ?" When the view thus stands the other one says : "May be, if the elision is obligatory". The difference will certainly be there *if* the elision were obligatory.

—

NOTES

P. 1. 1. 4 : *na dhātulopa ārdhadhātuke*

[1]

About *dhātulopa* spoken of in this Sū., the *Prad.* remarks : **गुणवृद्ध्योः प्राधान्यादयं निषेधः, न तु तद्गुणभावादिक्परिभाषायाः । 'दीधीवेवीटाम्' इति चासंबद्धं परिभाषानिषेधे स्यात्** : Moreover, if this Sū. were meant for **इक्परिभाषानिषेध**, the सूत्र 'दीधीवेवीटाम्' would be futile. For, as the *Uddy.* points out : **अलोऽन्त्यस्य इत्येतेनापि इक एव प्रसक्त्या परिभाषानिषेधे वैयर्थ्यम् ।**

अक्तपरिमाणस्य शब्दस्य : Explaining the term **अक्तपरिमाण**, Pat. (on P. 1. 1. 72, *Vār.* 7) writes : **इह केचिच्छब्दा अक्तपरिमाणानामर्थानां वाचका भवन्ति, य एते संख्याशब्दाः परिमाणशब्दाश्च । पञ्च सप्तेत्येकेनाप्यपाये न भवन्ति । द्रोणः, खारी, आढकमिति नैवाधिके भवन्ति न न्यूने । केचिद् यावदेव तद् भवति तावदेवाहुः — य एते जातिशब्दा गुणशब्दाश्च । तैलं घृतमिति खार्यामपि भवति द्रोणेऽपि । शुक्लो नीलः कृष्णः इति हिमवत्यपि भवति, वटकणिकामात्रेऽपि द्रव्ये । इमाश्चापि संज्ञा अक्तपरिमाणानामर्थानां क्रियन्ते, ताः केनाधिकस्य स्युः ।** (also on P. 1. 4. 13, *Vār.* 4). Commenting on P. 1. 1. 72, the *Prad.* explains **अक्तपरिमाणानाम्** by **परिच्छिन्नानाम्**; and Nāg. further explains **अक्तपरिमाण** by adding **आनुपूर्व्यविशेषोऽपि** to it and again further adding **परिमाणेत्युपलक्षणं परिच्छिन्नार्थानाम्**, and has remarked **वस्तुतः परिच्छिन्नपरिमाणकग्रहणे एकदेशविकृतन्यायस्याप्यप्रवृत्तिरिति भाष्याशयः ।** Then naturally arises the question, **किं प्रतिषेधेन**? what is the good of the prohibition ?

अतो वृत्तिकारो व्याचष्टे, धातोर्लोपो धातुलोपः. The Vṛttikāra (some exponent) explains **धातुलोप** as **धातोः लोपः** (i. e. **कृत्स्नस्य धातोर्लोपः**) and further explains it by **धात्वेकदेश(लोप)निमित्त आर्धधातुकः**. Pāṇ. has defined **सार्वधातुक** in **तिङ्शित् सार्वधातुकम्** (P. 3. 4. 113), and **आर्धधातुक** in **आर्धधातुकं शेषः** (P. 3. 4. 114), **लिट्** (=Perfect endings) **च** (P. 3. 4. 115) and **लिङाशिषि** (P. 3. 4. 116). **धातुलोप** is here explained as **धात्वेकदेशलोपनिमित्त आर्धधातुक इति ।**

अपर एवमाह — Here Bhar. has explained **धातुलोपः** in two different ways : (1) **धातोर्लोपः=कृत्स्नस्य धातोर्लोपः** (elision of the whole root) and (2) **धातोः एकदेशस्य लोपः** (elision of a part of it). So, **धातुलोप**=loss of the whole **धातु** as in **दूर** (formed from **दुर्+√इ+रक्**, *Uṇ. Sū.* 2. 20). In this sense, **धातुलोप** evidently should better be Bahuvrīhi though Bhar. appears to have taken it as a Tatp. and explained it as **धातुलोपनिमित्त** which gives it the required sense.

योऽपि कृत्स्नस्य ... ऽस्थावपि धातुलोपः — Bhar. is pointing out here that whether there is elision of the whole *dhātu* or that of only a part of it, in both cases it amounts to, and is called, धातुलोप for whether the whole *dhātu* is deleted or only a part of it, in our language generally this phenomenon is referred to as धातुलोप only. And because the धातुलोप is caused by the suffix (प्रत्यय), therefore, the suffix is called धातुलोपनिमित्त or simply धातुलोप. This has been clearly stated in the *Dīp.* योऽपि कृत्स्नस्य धातोर्लोपो ... इति शब्दवृत्तं कथयति. So whichever type of word is actually occurring, it is to be understood by the word धातुलोप (or simply लोप). Such is the usage in common parlance. This clearly shows that although the word *dhātu* should naturally signify the root, i. e. a complete root, which has all its parts intact, the word धातु (in धातुलोप here) in actual speech or usage is not used to signify a धातु that has all its parts are intact. This is but natural, because in that case the two, viz. Guṇa and Vṛddhi will not be there for being prohibited. When the whole is elided, who would undergo Guṇa or Vṛddhi ? Bhar. has put his whole argument in brief in the following words : धातुशब्दो धातावेव समुदाये, लोपोऽपि एकदेशाभाव एव, यस्त्वसावेकदेशाभावः समुदायस्य संबन्धित्वेन स दिश्यते अवयवकर्मणः समुदाये व्यपदेशात्, etc.

धातुग्रहणस्य दर्शनम् — The point to be noted here is that the word *dhātu* is used here in the sense of the whole *dhātu*, and a part of it is used as associated with it (i. e. *dhātu*). So the absence of part also is associated with *dhātu* and designated *dhātu* also. Cf. यस्त्वसावेकदेशाभावः समुदायस्य संबन्धित्वेन स दिश्यते। And this is but right, अवयवकर्मणः समुदाये व्यपदेशात्.

अवयवकर्मणः समुदाये व्यपदेशात् —Things pertaining to a part are often stated as pertaining to the whole. This is but common experience as illustrated by phrases like पटो दग्धः, अलंकृतो देवदत्तः, etc. The MS has one more illustration after this which appears to read किं नो देवदत्तः which may be interpreted to mean (figuratively): 'what is the good of देवदत्त to us ?'

But this cannot furnish an example for अवयवकर्मणः समुदाये व्यपदेशात्. It *may* be that here the original was क्लिन्नो. Devadatta is said to be drenched even when it is just his hands or feet are drenched. The text is emended accordingly.

पटो दग्धः अलंकृतो देवदत्तः — Here Bhar. has given some illustrations in support of his view. We say पटो दग्धः. It literally means the whole *paṭa* 'cloth' is burnt, though actually only a part of it is burnt, not the whole of it. Similarly, अलंकृतो देवदत्तः actually means Devadatta i. e. his (whole) body is adorned. But very often, the case is quite different. Only a part of his body is ornamented, and not the whole. It may be observed that in all these cases though the words *paṭa* and *devadatta* signify the whole *paṭa* and the whole body of Devadatta, they are used with reference to only a part thereof.

[2]

धातुग्रहणं किमर्थम् ? Here Bhar. has raised a question similar to केषां शब्दानाम्, which Pat. has raised in the beginning of his *Mbh.*, in connection with *śabdānuśāsanam* at the very beginning. The word *śabda* in *śabdānuśāsanam* is subordinate (गौण), as it is the first member of a Tatp. compound. Similarly, here the word *dhātu* being the first member of the compound, it is not correct to ask a question with reference to it. Pat. opens his *Mbh.* with अथ शब्दानुशासनम्; and thereafter asks the question : केषां शब्दानाम् ? The *Uddy.* explains this in the following words : उत्तरपदार्थान्तर्गतस्यापि पूर्वपदार्थस्य बुद्ध्या प्रविभागात् किमा प्रत्यवमर्शः। यथा राजपुरुष इत्युक्ते 'कस्य राज्ञ' इति। Thus here also the question 'धातुग्रहणं किमर्थम् ?' is not proper, and hence some Vṛttikāras have read this question as धातुलोप इति किमर्थम् ? This obviously removes the difficulty; the problem of the subordinate position of the word *dhātu* in *dhātulopa* is directly removed by taking up the whole compound. Though thus the above difficulty is removed, one point still remains to be explained. The expression *dhātulopa* consists of a whole of two parts, namely *dhātu* and *lopa*. But this does not improve matters for, though these two words speak of a group, they only give direction concerning only one of the components, and this is as it should be. For otherwise, it would only be a child's statement, laying down an injunction concerning something, with reference to which it is laying down prohibition.

गुणभावात् (गुणाभावात् is incorrect), A question cannot be asked with reference to a गौण शब्द in a समास. This has been explained above.

नैष दोषः — There is nothing wrong here. For, what possibly can be expected to occur on the basis of propriety (सामर्थ्य) indicates what is or may actually be expected. This sentence in the MS reads as °श्रापेक्ष्यं (or °क्षां ?) निर्दिशति। Both अपेक्षाम् and अपेक्ष्यम् are equally acceptable, though अपेक्ष्यम् may be preferred.

लूञ् लविता. Under this the MS reads : ननु च व्रत्तौ, which in AL has been plainly emended into वृत्तौ. वृत्ति (and, वृत्तिकार) has often been referred to by Bhar. (occasionally in the plural) though it is not possible to say which commentary or commentator is actually meant in all these places. The reading adopted by Sw (viz. तत्र) does not appear to do justice to the reading of the MS. which is व्रत्तौ. Intrinsic possibility appears to be in favour of the reading adopted (viz. वृत्तौ) here which is also read by AL.

अयमभिप्रायः. What is meant here is actually stated by Bhar. in what follows. If the word धातु is admitted into this Sū., then we can have there the compound *dhātulopa* ; and then it becomes possible to construe it as Bahuvrīhi, so that it can be an adjective to both (Guṇa and Vṛddhi) Then the code-letter *ñ* of the root is, of course, dropped. This naturally raises the question : कथं पुनः...?

[2. 1]

कथं पुनः etc. Thus, when the अनुबन्ध is elided, how can you say that अनुबन्धलोप is not elision of the धातु ? The answer to this question is as follows : In the धातुपाठ, the root is given as लूञ् छेदने (Pāṇ. Dhātup. 9. 13), which appears to show that ञ् is a part of the root. In the Dhātup. the root is usually given along with its code-letter(s). This may create an impression that the whole (लू+ञ्) is the root (cf. गणे सानुबन्धस्यैव पाठात् विशिष्टस्यैव धातुत्वम् — *Uddy.*). But, such is not the case. For, an *it* is described as a letter or a group of letters, attached to a word-element. But such a letter (or letters) is not seen in actual use in the spoken language. It does not form part of the word (like a root). It is meant only to indicate various points in that connection. The point relevant here is that the code-letter does not form (a part of) *dhātu*. It only indicates certain features of the behaviour of the root and is dropped after it has served its purpose (cf. अनुबन्धो न धात्वेकदेशः यस्मात् उपदेश एवेत्संज्ञा । प्रयोगे तु लूशब्द एव धातुसंज्ञः, केवलमसौ ञित्कार्यं लभते। लूशब्दस्यैव हि क्रियावाचित्वमिति तस्यैव युक्ता धातुसंज्ञा — *Prad.* Also read the *Uddy.* on this : गणे तु सानुबन्धस्य पाठात् विशिष्टस्यैव धातुत्वं स्यात्, अत आह — अनुबन्ध इति । यस्मादिति। उपदेशपदाभावेऽपि अन्तरङ्गत्वात् सर्वतः पूर्वं सा (= अनुबन्धसंज्ञा)। धातुसंज्ञा तु प्रत्ययविशेषे विधित्सित इति भावः। This point has very clearly been stated by Bhar. differently : इह धातुसंज्ञा इत्संज्ञा च यौगपद्येन प्रवर्तेते। यश्चेत्संज्ञः स नास्तीति शास्त्रेऽभ्युपगमः। एवं च सति यस्यामेवावस्थायां धातुसंज्ञा तस्यामेव चेत्संज्ञा। यदा च धातुसंज्ञा संनिपतिता तदा नैवास्त्यनुबन्ध इति असतो नास्ति धातुसंज्ञा (*p.* 1, *l.* 22 — *p.* 2, *l.* 2).

अथ पूर्वं धातुसंज्ञा एवमपि°. Here, after एवमपि the MS appears to read पावार्थान्यां धातुसंज्ञा but what this पावार्थान्यां is, it is hard to decide. Sw reads यावार्थान्यां (?), with the question mark after it, which clearly shows that the editor has kept the original reading (as he reads) as an insoluble difficulty. AL here read धात्वर्थाभ्यां; and the MS reading पावार्थान्यां is noted by them in a foot-note, but Sw has simply given a question mark in bracket after the reading as shown above. This clearly shows that both the editors have been unable to decide the correct reading here. Looking to the general sense intended to be conveyed here, it would perhaps be right and suitable to adopt the reading भावार्थानां धातुसंज्ञा (the term *dhātu* will apply to that much portion, which carries the required sense). But how to determine what section or part of the word has the required sense ? Bhar. has answered this question saying : the meaning conveyed by a word used in a text (प्रयोगशब्द) is fixed up by mentally segregating it, and subjecting it to अन्वयव्यतिरेक. And it is well-known, that a code-letter can have neither अन्वय (positive concomitance) nor व्यतिरेक (negative concomitance), which clearly shows that it has no meaning to convey. Hence, the principle of अन्वयव्यतिरेक can be applied to the remaining portion, word-element denoted by the धातुसंज्ञा will then be fixed up, and the particular meaning will be given to it,

(Here the statement of the *Uddy.* is illuminating: अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां तस्यैव क्रियावाचित्वात् गणपठितानामपि क्रियावाचिनां च धातुत्ववचनादिति भावः. Here, both the *Prad.* and the *Uddy.* may be read with advantage.

ससकारस्यापि दृष्टा क्रियावचनता. Here the MS. seems to read संपकारस्य and that reading is adopted by Sw without any suggestion or emendation; but प is evidently a mistake for स (and the Anusvāra should be deleted). It is clear from the context that here the reference is to a desiderative root as shown by तिष्ठासति in the context. Derivative roots are discussed by Pāṇ. in 3. 1. 5-32. In view of these AL have emended the original reading into सषकारस्य. But why the original 'प' is changed to 'ष' (in सषकारस्य) is not clear. Possibly, it is due to the similarity between the too letters. But, there is no justification at all for changing स (of सन्) here into ष. The correct reading would be ससकारस्य. Perhaps ष is adopted into the reading because स can easily be changed into ष and also because it is quite close to प. Similarly, तिष्यास्तती has in Sw been left as it is; only with a question mark after तिष्यास्ततीत्येवमादिषु(?)। But we think the context here is clear enough to show that a desiderative root is intended here. And AL have only narrowly missed the proper emendation. For these secondary roots, see P. 3. 1. 5-32; and for सन्नन्त in particular see P. 3. 1. 7 and the *Vār.* 9 on it. To come to the explanation, here Bhar. is showing that the name (धातु) can be applied to any word that stands the test of अन्वयव्यतिरेक which is sound enough; and can, as such, be applied to all similar matters. From स्था with the addition of सन्, we get the desiderative base तिष्ठास which, with the addition of ति (present, 3rd person, sing.), gives तिष्ठासति. It can be conjugated like any other धातु, defined as क्रियावचनो (भाववचनो वा) धातुः. There can be no doubt that it is a धातु. Only, it is one of the secondary roots, formed by applying various suffixes to the primary root or other words (cf. सनाद्यन्ता धातवः, P. 3. 1. 32).

[2. 2]

वृषभो रोरवीति। सत्यार्धधातुकग्रहणे शब्दवत्त्वादन्यपदार्थस्य. This is a reply to the question 'आर्धधातुक इति किमर्थम्?' raised by Pat. in his *Mbh.* The word आर्धधातुक forms an अन्यपदार्थ and so a Bahu° is clearly conveyed. In these words Pat. has set forth these counterexamples with the idea of refuting this Sū. and at the same time declared that the inclusion of the word *dhātu* in the Sū. has no purpose to serve.

[2. 3]

चत्वारः पक्षाः. The MS actually reads as : चत्वारा पक्ष्याः संभवंतोत्रोपन्यस्तौ. Even after correcting the minor errors, what remains, viz. चत्वारः पक्षाः संभवन्तो ऽत्रोपन्यस्तौ presents a big problem. Obviously the subject in plural (पक्षाः) and the predicate in dual (उपन्यस्तौ) ill suit each other. Further, curiously enough,

both चत्वारः पक्षाः and उपन्यस्तौ have their own justification, since the *Dīp.* which follows actually sets forth the four alternatives, while what is equally true is that the *Mbh.* here (अत्र) mentions only two alternatives. So the emendation has to be done in such a way as will be in conformity with these facts. We therefore whole-heartedly accept Sw's emendation, which reads as चत्वारः पक्षाः संभवन्ति (द्वाव)त्रोपन्यस्तौ. The word संभवन्ति shows that there are theoretically four alternatives possible (which actually follow in the *Dīp.*). When Bhar. says द्वावत्रौपन्यस्तौ, he is referring, by अत्र, to the *Mbh.* here. The two alternatives mentioned in the *Mbh.* here are the first two mentioned in the *Dīp.* (Read the *Mbh.* : किं पुनरिदमार्धधातुकग्रहणं लोपविशेषणम् ... आहोस्विद् गुणवृद्धिविशेषणम् ... ?). The third alternative अन्तरेण बहुव्रीहिमुभयविशेषणमावृत्तेः does not seem to have been mentioned in the *Mbh.* while the fourth one (बहुव्रीहिः) is mentioned at a later stage in the discussion on this Sū. (I. 52. 16). The next two sentences लोपविशेषण° and गुणवृद्धि° require no remarks. There is no doubt about the still next two sentences also. But it may be noted that आर्धधातुक in the two cases goes with लोप and गुणवृद्धी respectively as their विशेषण. In the third alternative, *dhātulopa* is not a Bahu. compound, though आर्ध° is an adjective to both, as it happens in the case of the Sū., एकाच उपदेशेऽनुदात्तात् (7. 2. 10). Here, on उपदेशे, Bhaṭṭoji writes in the *Sid-Kau.* : उपदेशे इत्युभयान्वयि, which is explained by the *Tattvabodhinī* as मध्ये पाठात् देहलीदीपन्यायेन पूर्वोत्तराभ्यां संबध्यते इत्यर्थः । तत्रोत्तरान्वयस्य कर्तुं गन्तुम् इत्यादाविण्निषेधः फलम् नित्स्वरेण संप्रत्युदात्तत्वात् । पिपक्षति विभ(? °भि)त्सति इत्यादाविण्निषेधस्तु पूर्वान्वयस्य फलम् । द्वित्वे कृते अनेकाच्त्वात् ।

Here the *Prad.* remarks : आर्धधातुकग्रहणं लोपविशेषणं वा, गुणवृद्धिविशेषणं वा, बहुव्रीहिपक्षे उभयविशेषणं वा इति पक्षत्रयसंभवात् प्रश्नः ॥ He does not mention the third alternative of Bhar. Also read : बहुव्रीहीति । उभयानुग्रहायेति भावः । यद्यपि धातुलोपे इति समस्तमार्धधातुकविशेषणं तथापि विशेषणशब्दः परिच्छेदकरः इति न दोषः (*Uddy.*) ।

[3]

किं पुनरिदमार्धधातुकग्रहणम् ? The point here is : how is the word *ārdhadhātuka*, included in the definition, to be construed ? And Bhar. himself has pointed out the two possibilities : (i) आर्धधातुकाधारो लोपो गुणवृद्ध्यभावस्य उपलक्षणत्वेन उपादीयते; and (ii) आर्धधातुकाधारयोः गुणवृद्ध्योः अतन्निमित्तो लोपः उपलक्षणत्वेन उपादीयते इति । Here, there are two alternatives set forth by Bhar. The main points in this reply are : (i) The word *ārdhadhātuka* is an adjective of *lopa* ; and (ii) it is an adjective of Guṇa-Vṛddhi. Thus, it is clear that the word *ārdhadhātuka* is to be construed as adjective to *lopa* caused by it, in the former, while in the latter it is to be construed as an adjective to गुणवृद्धी. The upshot of all this is : In the first alternative, Guṇa or Vṛddhi dose not take place if the elision is brought about by an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix, while in the other, the Guṇa-Vṛddhi do not take place, if they are caused by an *ārdhadhātuka* suffix. The *Uddy.* explains this thus :

आर्धधातुक will be लोपविशेषण, because it is श्रुत (directly mentioned); but it will be गुणादिविशेषण because Guṇa-Vṛddhi are प्रधान (being the predicate).

उपेद्धः प्रेद्धः इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति. This is the idea: The Guṇa in *upeddha* etc. is a mere Saṁdhi operation, laid down in the rule P. 6. 1. 87 : आद्गुणः. It is not a result of any following *ārdhadhātuka* suffix. The word *iddha* itself is an example of धातुलोप (i. e. धात्ववयवलोप : elision of *-n-* of *indh*) owing to the following *ārdhadhātuka* ppl. suffix *-ta*. Consequently, if in interpreting P. 1. 1. 4 one connects आर्धधातुके with धातुलोपे and not with गुणवृद्धी — thus leaving the latter unrestrained — then P. 1. 1. 4 will apply to *upeddha* etc. also and will prevent the Guṇa. Bhar. does not explain this apparently because it is clear. Instead he examines the validity of the illustrations *upeddha, preddha*, adduced in the *Mbh.*, in the *Dīp.* : नन्वन्तरङ्गत्वात् पूर्वमेवा° etc.

नन्वन्तरङ्गत्वात् पूर्वमेवा° ... etc. An objection is raised against the examples *upeddha* etc. According to the objector, *upeddha* etc. are not correct examples of an undesired prohibition of Guṇa by P. 1. 1. 4. For, according to the maxim पूर्वं धातुरुपसर्गेण युज्यते, the prefix *upa* will already combine with the root into *upe°* even before there is *dhātulopa*. The *dhātulopa*, which takes place subsequently, cannot annul the Guṇa which is a *fait accompli*. The objector therefore suggests the example *kaṣṭeddha* 'enkindled with difficulty'. Here there is no prefix. The root (*indh*) will first combine with the ppl. suffix *-ta* giving the form *iddha*. There is a *dhātulopa* caused by an *ārdhadhātuka*. Also, the word *ārdhadhātuka*, on the alternative we are considering, is connected with *dhātulopa* alone, not with Guṇa-Vṛddhī. So any Guṇa-Vṛddhi can be prohibited, provided the other condition is satisfied. So Guṇa in *kaṣṭeddha* is in danger. That is why, according to the objector, *kaṣṭeddha* is to be preferred to *upeddha* etc.

There is no reply given directly to this objection. Obviously the *Dīp.* नैष दोषः ... etc. (*p.* 2, *l.* 3) is to be taken as replying this objection also.

यदि च उपसर्गात् ... The *Dīp.* is here unfortunately partly corrupt (यदि च पसर्गैत्वं त्वन्यक्तश्चेमुपगतरे) and partly damaged (space left for about seven or eight letters in the MS). It seems to be a comment on the *Mbh.* : अस्तु लोपविशेषणम् । कथम् उपेद्धः प्रेद्धः ? Accordingly, we tentatively supply the missing portion and read the *Dīp.* as यदि च उपसर्गात् पूर्वं प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः कथमुपेद्धः प्रेद्धः ? It has to be noted that we have supplied only *contents* and not the missing *words* of the *Dīp.*

नैष दोषः । वक्ष्यत्येव ... etc. On the basis of a *Mbh.* passage (यदि पूर्वम् ... etc.) it is pointed out that whether Guṇa is *bahiraṅga* or *antaraṅga*, it is of no consequence. If *antaraṅga*, it will necessarily take place first and once it is there, prohibition cannot cancel it. If *bahiraṅga*, it is as good as non-existent and so the prohibitory rule cannot take cognizance of something which does not

exist. So Guṇa in *upeddha* etc. is safe whether *bahiraṅga* or *antaraṅga*. (So एवमपि in the *Dīp.* presupposes न दोषः which, however, is not actually said there.)

As regards *kaṣṭeddha*, here the Guṇa will certainly be *bahiraṅga*. But, for that very reason, it will remain unaffected by the prohibition. So apparently, this suggested illustration fares no better than the original *upeddha* etc. — अयं तु नोक्तः ... etc. अयं refers, not to the preceding solution (*bahiraṅga/antaraṅga*) but to the following (*aniglakṣaṇatva*). — After परिहारः, some such clause as यतो भाष्यकारो मन्यते 'since the Bhāṣyakāra thinks that' is understood.

ननु च नाजानन्तर्ये बहिष्ट्वप्रक्लृप्तिः । An objection is here raised (and finally ruled out) against the use of the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari. in the present context. The objection is taken on the basis of the Pari. नाजानन्तर्ये बहिष्ट्वप्रक्लृप्तिः (51) which says that something cannot be regarded as *bahiraṅga* if contiguity of (two or more) vowels is involved. In the present case there is such an *ajānantarya* (of $a + i$) in *upeddha* etc. So the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari. cannot be invoked here. The reply consists in giving a correct application of the नाजानन्तर्ये Pari. It is pointed out that the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari. is not allowed to operate (by the *nājānantarye* Pari.) only where a close contiguity of vowels is mentioned in the original rule which teaches some operation (e. g. *ik* and *ac* in P. 6. 1. 77). In the present case, P. 1. 1. 4 is of the nature of a prohibition; no contiguity of vowels is mentioned there specifically. So the *nājānantarye* Pari. cannot oppose the operation of the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari.

That this is the purport of the passage is clear from Kaiy's explanation which reads : ननु 'नाजानन्तर्ये ...' इति निषेधात् कथं परिभाषाप्रवृत्तिः ? यत्र कार्यविधावानन्तर्येणाचोराश्रयणं तत्र निषेधादनुपस्थानं परिभाषायाः, यथा अक्षद्यूरिति । तत्र हि 'इको यणचि' इति वचनादिगचोराश्रयणम् । अस्मिंस्तु प्रतिषेधसूत्रे नास्त्यचोराश्रयणमित्यदोषः । The first half of the *Dīp.*, however, is not quite clear. It seems to first suggest (and then refute) two interpretations of the proper occasion when the *nājānatnarye* is to apply (and thus to prohibit the operation of the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari.,) viz. (i) The *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* Pari. is to apply only if otherwise there is no knowledge of the correct and the incorrect form (न साध्वसाधुपरिज्ञानं चेद् भवति); and (2) it is not to apply if a phoneme is to be brought into existence (अन्ये वर्णनिष्पत्तिरित्याहुः). But the details are not clear to us and so we refrain from going into them. (It is significant that Kaiy. has ignored this part.) The final interpretation is introduced with the words तस्मादयमर्थः.

The text is partly corrupt, and so uncertain. Our translation is tentative and open to correction.

हिरण्ययूः — The word is formed from हिरण्य + दिव् + क्विप् (in the sense हिरण्येन दीव्यतीति). The suffix *kvip* brings about the substitution of *ū* in the place of *v* by P. 6. 4. 19 : छ्वोः शूडनुनासिके च. It is claimed that in the sequence दिऊस्, although *ū* owes itself to an external factor (viz. *kvip*), and is therefore *bahiraṅga* (and so *asiddha*), still it does not come into the way of the combination *i* + *ū* = *yū* by the rule इको यणचि, since that rule expressly mentions the close succession of *ik* + *ac*. This is the force of the Pari. : नाजानन्तर्ये बहिष्ट्वप्रक्लृप्तिः.

In line two, अप्रवृत्तिः = 'असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे' इत्यस्याः परिभाषाया अप्रवृत्तिः.

क्नोपयति इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति. The *Uddy.* on this writes : क्नूय्धातोर्णिचि हेतुमति च (P. 3. 1. 26), पुकि (P. 7. 3. 36), लोपो व्योर् ... (P. 6. 1. 66) इति यलोपः। After this, by पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च (P. 7. 3. 86), it takes गुण ; and we get क्नोपयति. But if any *dhātulopa* will do, then the गुण caused by the आर्धधातुक suffix, viz. *ṇic* will be undesiredly prevented. Bhar. does not explain this objection raised in the *Mbh.* Instead, he has an objection (left unanswered) against this objection itself. He says that the *puk* being *bahiraṅga* (as it is caused by the distant factor *ṇic*), there will be no deletion of *y*. No *dhātulopa*, no Guṇa-prohibition. He further points out that in case the deletion is justified on the strength of the *nipātana* चेले क्नोपेः (P. 3. 4. 33), Guṇa also will take place on the strength of the same *nipātana* : निपातनात् गुणो भविष्यति। It may be observed that this is not a new argument of Bhar. It is just an anticipation of what Pat. says immediately afterwards.

यद्येवम् = यदि 'उपेद्धः' इत्यादौ गुणस्य बहिरङ्गत्वेन तत्र प्रतिषेधस्य अप्रवृत्तिः. The *Mbh.* suggests that we go further, and dropping the word *dhātu* read the Sū. simply as न लोप आर्धधातुके. But, the question is immediately asked in the *Mbh.* : If any *lopa* will do for the operation of P. 1. 1. 4, how will you prevent it in the forms of *lūñ* (like *lavitā*) where there is a mere *anubandhalopa* and not *dhātulopa* ? The reply is simple : The deletion has to be caused by an *ārdhadhātuka* and the *anubandhalopa* is surely not caused by an *ārdhadhātuka* (न चानुबन्धलोप आर्धधातुकनिमित्तकः). So P. 1. 1. 4 will not apply to it.

Another question : Is not the word *dhātu* necessary to have a Bahu. compound, so that the word *ārdhadhātuka* could qualify both धातुलोपे and गुणवृद्धी ? No. As shown in another alternative, by a mere repetition a single word आर्धधातुके can be made to qualify both.

[4]

परिगणनं कर्तव्यम्. After this परिगणन the rule will read as : 'न यङ्यक्क्यवलोपे आर्धधातुके'. In this way are accomplished क्नोपयति and other formations. Only in the case of वलोप some peculiar point has to be resorted to so as to pre-

clude the prohibition from applying to *sriv* (जीवेः प्रत्ययौ न स्रिवेः), which will then account for forms like *āsremāṇam*. About this परिगणन, the *Uddy.* remarks : वाक्यकारः सूत्रेऽव्याप्तिपरिहाराय परिगणनमाह । अत्र 'यस्य हलः' इति लोपः समुदायलोपः इति मत्वा यक्क्ययोः परिगणनं 'बेभिदिता' इत्युदाहरणं च बोध्यम् । The *Prad.* here points out : 'व' इत्यत्राकारोऽपि विवक्षितः । तेन धातुपाठे योऽकारान्तः पठितः तस्य ग्रहणम् । अन्यथा स्रिविः कथं निवार्येत ?

यङ्यक्क्यवलोपे प्रतिषेधः. Under this *Vār.*, the Bhāṣyakāra has noticed some relevant formations ; and the *Prad.* has explained the various forms grammatically in brief. Partly, these have already been given above ; the rest are given below : बेभिदिता — बेभिद्यशब्दात् तृच्, इट्, 'यस्य हलः' इति यलोपः ॥ मरीमृजः — 'यङोऽचि च' (2. 4. 74) इति यङो लुक् । कुषुभमगधशब्दौ कण्ड्वादिगणपठितौ धातू, ताभ्यां यक्, 'ण्वुल् तृचौ' (3. 1. 133), 'यस्य हलः' इति यलोपः ॥ समित्-दृषच्छब्दाभ्यां क्यजन्ताभ्यां प्रत्ययौ ण्वुल् तृचौ । क्यस्य विभाषा' इति यलोपः ॥ The *Uddy.* writes — अत्र 'यस्य हलः' इति लोपः समुदायलोप इति मत्वा यक्क्ययोः परिगणनम्, 'बेभिदिता' इत्युदाहरणं च बोध्यम् ।

एवं पठ्यमाने क्नोपयत्यादयः. Thus, the forms क्नोपयति and others are established. Only there is some peculiarity in the case of the elision of *v*, which will be explained below.

वलोप इत्यत्र — In the case of the the elision of *v*, we have to note that this rule will apply to all roots ending in *v* with the exception of *sriv*. This will be explained under जीरदानुः इत्यत्र below.

[4. 1]

नुम्लोपस्त्रिव्यनुबन्धलोपे. Here Bhar. at the outset tells us that the expression *num* is used in the *Vār.* in the sense in which it is used by the older teachers, viz. a penultimate *n* in general. Cf. व्यञ्जनान्तः अनुषङ्गः. ('An *anuṣanga* means the penultimate nasal of the base of a root or a noun'). Here, it may be remembered that Pāṇini has laid down the augment *num* for all roots having a short *i* as a code-letter, (e. g. *ṇidi=nind*; इदितो नुम् धातोः., P. 7. 1. 58) and that being *mit*, it will be placed after the last vowel of the root (cf. मिदचोऽन्त्यात् परः, P. 1. 1. 47). Here, however, as Bhar. tells us, the word *num* is used, not in the Pāṇinian sense, but in that of his predecessors as mentioned above. This being so, the expression *num* covers even those cases where the penultimate *n* is not technically *num* (e. g. the one indicated by the code-letter *i*), but is an independent *n* read as such in the *upadeśa* itself. So in forms like अभाजि, रागः etc. mentioned in the *Mbh.*, although the roots are read as *bhanj* and *ranj*, the elision of *n* (P. 6. 4. 33 ; 26–27) is looked upon as *num lopa*, thus bringing it in the purview of this permissive *Vār.*

The *Vār.* is meant for removing the bar and allowing Guṇa-Vṛddhi in spite of *dhātulopa* (of *n* in *abhāji*, of *v* in *āsremāṇam* [from *sriv-*] in the cases enumerated.

So the *Prad.* remarks : परिगणने सति धातुग्रहणं न कर्तव्यं भवति इति अनुबन्धलोपः प्रयोजनत्वेन पठितः । Cf. भर्तृहरि's remarks : अत्र हि परिगणनादेतेषु नास्ति प्रतिषेधः । असति हि परिगणने धातुलोप इति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति ।

इक्प्रकरणात् नुम्लोपे वृद्धिः. Here we are told that, as a rule, this prohibition occurs only where *ikaḥ* is present to bring about the recession of other स्थानिन्s. In अभाजि, रागः etc. the prohibition cannot take effect because the Vṛddhi there is not taught for *ik* as such, but for *a* (अत उपधायाः, P. 7. 2. 116) etc. Cf. the *Prad.* : तेन यत्र इक्परिभाषा स्थान्यन्तरनिवृत्तये व्याप्रियते तत्रायं निषेधः इत्यर्थः.

[4. 3]

प्रत्ययाश्रयत्वादन्यत्र सिद्धम्. In other cases (i. e. स्रिव् and अनुबन्धलोप) the word आर्धधातुक in this सूत्र is to be construed as adjective to *lopa* also (*ubhaya* = 1. *lopa* 2. Guṇa-Vṛddhi). As an objection to this statement the *Mbh.* states the case of जीरदानुः. Here, the final 'व्' of √ 'जीव्' is dropped when रदानु follows, not because of the following प्रत्यय, but because it has been laid down in लोपो व्योर्वलि (P. 6. 1. 66). It is a pure वर्णकार्य. The solution for this, in continuation of 'प्रत्ययाश्रयत्वात् ...' is given in the next *Vār.* : रकि ज्यः etc.

[4. 4]

रकि ज्यः संप्रसारणम्. This is the reply. It consists in refusing to look upon जीरदानु as a single primary noun (जीव् + रदानु); it is now looked upon as a compound — a Bahu. compound — of जीर + दानु.

But how is जीर formed? It is formed from ज्या (>जी by Saṁprasāraṇa) + रक्. The Bhāṣyakāra has clearly expressed his view on रकि ज्यः संप्रसारणम् in the words : नैतज्जीवे रूपम्, रक्येतत् ज्यः संप्रसारणम् । As the *Prad.* commenting on this says, this interpretation explains the *avagraha* after *jīra* in the Padapāṭha, and also the Udātta on *ra* (: *jīrá-dānu-*) : एवं च जीर इत्यवग्रहः सिध्यति । बहुव्रीहित्वाच्च जीरदानुशब्दे रेफाकार उदात्तः, thus confirming the *Dīp*, which says : अवग्रहश्च सिद्धः etc. In सिद्धः प्रतिषेधः, the reference is to the Guṇa.

वृद्धिः प्रकृत्यन्तरम्. This is a reply to the advocate of *parigaṇana* by the one who opposes it. The *parigaṇana* is not necessary for *upabarhaṇa*; it is not derived from *bṛṁh* (as the opponent believes), but from *bṛh*, which is an independent root (प्रकृत्यन्तरम्). Surely there is nothing to prevent Guṇa when the form is desired in this way. The *Prad.* quotes the Dhātup. : बृह बृहि

वृद्धौ (I, 771, 772). Here, actually वृह and वृहि are given as two different धातुs (or प्रकृतिs). Here Pat. himself raises the question कथं ज्ञायते — बृहिः प्रकृत्यन्तरम् इति? He answers this question as follows: अचि इति लोप उच्यते, अनजादावपि हि दृश्यते — निबृह्यते। अनिटि इति चोच्यते, इडादावपि दृश्यते — निबर्हिता, निबर्हितुमिति। अजादावपि न दृश्यते — बृंहयति, बृंहकः। तस्मान्नार्थः परिगणनेन। Whereas Pat. gives logical reasons why it is necessary to accept *bṛh* as an independent root, Bhar. (आतश्च ... खिलपाठे) mentions the fact that all Dhātupāṭhas read unanimously (अविगानेन) *bṛh* while Kaiy., as we saw above, actually quotes the Dhātup.

खिलपाठ = धातुपाठ (here). Commenting on *upadeśa* in उपदेशेऽजनुनासिक इत् (P. 1. 3. 2), the काशिका says: उपदेशः = शास्त्रवाक्यानि, सूत्रपाठः, खिलपाठश्च. The न्यास explains: खिलपाठः धातुपाठः। चकारात् प्रातिपदिकपाठश् (i. e. the Gaṇapāṭha) च.

न ह्ययमाहिरिव पञ्चपदविषयः इति. Bhar. makes this remark in order to explain why the two are प्रकृत्यन्तरs (independent words). It was said above that *bṛh* has been read as an independent root, along with *bṛṁh* in the Dhātup; it is not just regarded as a secondary form of *bṛṁh*. The reason for this is stated here. It is suggested that *bṛh* is a ful-fledged root; it yields forms in all tenses and moods. It is not a root of restricted application, having only a few fossilized forms, like *āh*. Pāṇini in 3. 4. 84: ब्रुवः पञ्चानामादित आहो ब्रुवः teaches substitution of *āh* in the place of *brū* in five forms of the Pres. Indic (which, in this case, has the endings of *liṭ* instead of *laṭ*). We have thus only five forms from *āh*, viz. आह, आहतुः, आहुः, आत्थ and आहथुः. *Āh* is thus पञ्चपदविषयः. So it is not read in the Dhātup., but mentioned in the Sūtra. The root *bṛh* is unlike that, it could be called *सर्वपदविषयः. Hence its inclusion in the Dhātup.

It is interesting to note that this parallel of the *pañcapada* nature of *āh* occurs in the *Vṛtti* also on the *Vāk*. II. 178 in the same context. Read: न हि धातुरूपं परमार्थेन किञ्चित् विद्यते। व्यवहारस्तु कैश्चित् क्रियते। केचिदस्ति सकारमात्रमातिष्ठन्ते। तस्य त्वकारागमो विषयविशेषे तैर्विधीयते। तद्यथा गनोगन्तीति प्रकृत्यन्तरं गत्यर्थेषु निरुक्ते पठ्यते। तथा आहिधातुं पञ्चपदविषयमन्ये वचनार्थं पठन्ति। तद्यथा — ग्लौरिवासितपक्षस्य साऽमुदे चारुहासिनि। आहेः पञ्चपदानीव त्वमेव शरणं मम[1] ॥ इति ॥ It seems, however, that here the *Vṛtti* suggests that *āh* was actually read by some. — We do not know from which grammarian-cum-poet the stanza ग्लौरिवासितपक्षस्य comes.

1. Shri Raghunātha Śarma explains the stanza thus in his *Ambākartrī*: इयं च खण्डितां नायिकामनुनयतः कस्यचिदुक्तिः। अस्यार्थः। हे चारुहासिनि! ··· सा यस्याः समागमसंभावनया मयि त्वया कोपः कृतः, सा असितपक्षस्य कृष्णपक्षस्य, ग्लौरिव चन्द्र इव, अमुदे मम मोदाय न भवति, दर्शनस्यापि दुर्लभत्वात्। अतो मम आहेर्धातोः आह आहतुरित्यादिपञ्चपदानीव त्वमेव शरणं सुप्रापत्वादिति मत्वा मानस्त्यज्यतामिति।

भेद्यते छेद्यते इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति. In the महाभाष्य, the sentence reads : 'यदि परिगणनं न क्रियते, 'भेद्यते, छेद्यते' अत्रापि प्राप्नोति।' In भेद्यते and छेद्यते, there is धातुलोप, in that *i* (*ṇic*) in *bhedi-* etc. is deleted (णेरनिटि, P. 6. 4. 51) when the आर्धधातुक suffix *yak* follows. Also the Guṇa (*bhid>bhed*) is caused by the following *ārdhadhātuka* suffix *ṇic*. So whichever way you construe *dhātulopa*, the prohibition of Guṇa is inevitable, if परिगणन is not resorted to. This is what Bhar. means when he says: द्वयमप्येतदार्धधातुके, णिलोपस्यार्धधातुकनिमित्तत्वात्, णौ चार्धधातुके गुणवृद्ध्योः प्राप्तिरिति। But he himself does not like this argument, and so he says : इदं तु नोपपद्यते, सार्वधातुकविकरणाभ्यां णावेव गुणस्य कृतत्वात्। The Guṇa is a *fait accompli*, it having been executed (*bhid+ṇi=bhedi*) even before *ya* and *te* come in.

नैवं विज्ञायते — Here the *Mbh.* says that धातुलोप is not a Tatpuruṣa (धातोर्लोपः), but a Bahu° (धातोर्लोपो यस्मिन्). In the *Dīp.* (बहुव्रीहौ सति ... etc.) Bhar. brings out the significance of this suggestion. In Bahu° both लोप and गुणवृद्धी are seen to have one and the same cause (एकनिमित्तत्वाभ्युपगम) while in the other, भेद्यते इत्यन्यस्मिन् आर्धधातुके लोपः अन्यस्मिन् [चार्धधातुके] गुणवृद्धी इति।

[5]

यत्र हल्चोरादेशः. Bhar. has here skipped over a considerable portion of the *Mbh*. After the cases like *bhedyate* are accounted for by taking *dhātulopa* as a Bahu° and the absence of Vṛddhi in *abhāji* etc. is accounted for by making P. 1. 1. 4 apply only to what is called *iglakṣaṇa* Guṇa-Vṛddhi by the opponent of *pariganana*, the advocate of *pariganana* points out that in that case Vṛddhi (of the radical syllable) in *pāpacaka* (coming from *pac>pāpac+yaṅ+ṇvul*) cannot be prevented, since here it is not *iglakṣaṇa*; it is taught specifically for *ă* by the rule : *ata upadhāyāḥ* (P. 7. 2. 116). The objection is refuted on the ground that there is another remedy for this. We can rely on स्थानिवद्भाव. In *pāpac+ya(ṅ)+ṇvul* (=*aka*), the vowel *a* of *ya* is elided by P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः (and the consonant *y* by P. 6. 4. 49 : यस्य हलः). By अचः परस्मिन् पूर्वविधौ (P. 1. 1. 57), the elided *a* can still be regarded as being there, which thus cancels the penultimate status of the radical *a*. Hence no threat of Vṛddhi. When everything thus seems to be satisfactorily explained even in the absence of *pariganana*, Kātyāyana now makes a radical suggestion. He says that the rule (P. 1. 1. 4) itself can be scrapped. For, here also, the undesired Guṇa-Vṛddhi (in *bebhiditā* etc.) can be prevented successfully by resorting to अल्लोपस्य स्थानिवत्त्वम् ('अनारम्भो वा' *Vār*. 7. On this the *Mbh.* : अनारम्भो वा पुनरस्य योगस्य न्याय्यः ... अत्रापि [i. e. in बेभिदिता etc.] अकारलोपे कृते तस्य स्थानिवद्भावात् गुणवृद्धी न भविष्यतः।). So P. 1. 1. 4 is superfluous. At this stage, an objection is brought in against this suggestion. It is all right where a single vowel like *a* is deleted. But what where a cluster *ya* is deleted — strictly is replaced by *lopa* (by P. 2.4. 74 ;

यङोऽचि च) in forms like लोलुवः etc. from लोलूय (>लोलू>लोलुव्+अ. the पचाद्यच्)? The substitution of *lopa* is here for the cluster य्+अ (हलचोरादेशः as the *Mbh.* says). It is not just an अजादेश. When स्थानिवद्भाव is thus not available, how can you prevent the Vṛddhi here if P. 1. 1. 4 is not retained?

अत्राप्यकारलोपे कृते — Here (लोलूय+अच्) also one could drop *a* (of *ya*) first by अतो लोपः[1] (P. 6. 4. 48). So स्थानिवद्भाव will be available. The remaining *y* is to be dropped by यङोऽचि च (P. 2. 4. 74).

अयमभिप्रायः। यकारमात्र ... etc. The exact point of this *Dīp.* is not clear at first sight. We have probably to depend upon Kaiy. and Nāg. for it. This is the idea : The *Dīp.* has to be understood not so much as explaining the *Mbh.* (अत्राप्यकारलोपे etc.), but as refuting a possible objection against it. The objection is like this : In saying यङ् (in यङोऽचि च) Pāṇini may have positively meant the cluster *ya*. If you first elide its *a* (by अतो लोपः) the remaining element *y* cannot be called a *pratyaya* and consequently cannot be dropped by the help of the rule यङोऽचि च. (P. 2. 4. 74 : यङोऽचि च teaches *luk* and a *luk* applies only to a *pratyaya* : P. 1. 1. 61). Now Bhar. says that this need not be so necessarily. Even after the elision of *a*, the remaining part *y* can continue to be named *pratyaya*, just as *t* (of *-ti*), the ending of 3 sing. Imperf. or Aor. etc., continues to be named *pratyaya* after the final *i* is deleted (P. 3. 4. 99 : नित्यं ङितः. एकान्त, an integral part, here refers to *i*, the final part of *ti*). Further, *y* (in *yaṅ*) could be a generic reference, standing for all kinds of *y*, whether single or followed by *a* etc.

लुकि कृते न प्राप्नोति. The implied idea is that the *luk*- elision (by P. 2. 4. 74) is obligatory (नित्य). So it will have to be effected first. Once the cluster *ya* is thus deleted, there in no scope for अल्लोप, and consequently for स्थानिवद्भाव also. As Bhar. tells us, this is going to be explained later on (वक्ष्यमाणः=वक्ष्यते, against P. 3. 2. 124).

इदमिह संप्रधार्यम्. In the *Mbh.* here it is maintained that in the conflict of the two equally powerful rules P. 2. 4. 74 : यङोऽचि च and अतो लोपः (6. 4. 48), the latter will prevail (P. 1. 4. 2). The *Dīp.* लोपस्यावकाशः etc. illustrates how both rules have their own exclusive domains. It further makes clear, that *luk* in the *Mbh.* means *luk* of the mere consonant *y* which remains (अवशिष्टस्य) after *a* is elided. When one understands a cluster by *yaṅ*, then there is a conflict. So विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्.

1. According to the tradition, here the अकारलोप is to be effected by the योगविभाग mentioned is the *Mbh.* later on. Cf. the *Chāyā* : योगविभागेनेति भावः (on the *Mbh.* अत्राप्यकारलोपे कृते). We think the योगविभाग should not be brought in here at this stage, as the *Mbh.* has not yet introduced it.

The last sentence is read as परत्वात् यङो लोपः in the MS. This is obviously erroneous. अल्लोपः is expected. Sw supplies अकारस्य after यङो. We follow this ingenious suggestion.

नित्यो लुक्. Because it is कृताकृतप्रसङ्गी. कृतेऽप्यल्लोपे प्राप्नोति, अकृतेऽपि प्राप्नोति as the *Mbh.* says. With the *Dip.* शास्त्रप्रवृत्तिनित्येति लुको नित्यत्वम्, cf. Kaiy.: लुक्शास्त्रप्रवृत्तिर्नित्या. On this Nāg.: ननु यस्य लोपः कृतस्तस्य लुगप्राप्तेराह — लुक्शास्त्रेति.

लुगप्यनित्यः — If अल्लोप is effected first, the *luk* affects only *y*; if अल्लोप is not first effected, then the *luk* affects *ya*. Hence the scope for the Pari. शब्दान्तरस्य च प्राप्नुवन् विधिरनित्यो भवति, as the *Mbh.* says. The *Dip.* explains that the अनित्यत्व of लुक् is stated now on the assumption of शब्दे भेदः. The Pari. requires शब्दान्तरत्व. In the present case, *ya* is said to be one word element, *y* another. On the assumption of difference (*bheda*) in the word-element the Pari. applies, thus rendering the *luk* non-obligatory. Thus लुक् also is अनित्य. Thus, though both लुक् and लोप are अनित्य, of these two, लोप is पर, and so 'अतो लोपः' operates.

अनवकाशस्तर्हि लुक्. लुक् is अनवकाश. But how? Because it is taught when the *a*- elision is already imminent (*nāprāpta*). If लुक् is not laid down, there will be अतो लोपः (elision of mere *a*). Looking at it in another way, the elision (लुक्) of प्रत्यय is laid down. But mere यकार is not a प्रत्यय. Why? It does not exist in usage; and in grammar mere यकार (not accompanied by a vowel) is not anywhere taught as a प्रत्यय. Hence its existence cannot be established as a प्रत्यय by उपदेश also. Again, in यङोऽचि च (P. 2. 4. 74) a group of letters is mentioned. So there will be no scope for लुक्, if 'अतो लोपः' is allowed to operate here.

सावकाशो लुक्। कोऽवकाशः? अवशिष्टः। What is meant is this: लोप and लुक् differ in their scopes. The scope of *lopa* is *a*, that of *luk* is *y*. And in लोलूयिता etc. we occasionally get a mere यकार as a प्रत्यय after the *a* of *ya* is elided by अतो लोपः. We clearly recognize *y* there as being the same as *ya*. Nor is the final *a* in *ya* intended to be expressed.

अथापि कथंचित् इति। पूर्वोक्तया कल्पनयोच्यते। Here पूर्वोक्ता कल्पना—The cluster यङ् is intended.

एवमप्यल्लोपे ... etc.

This is the योगविभाग:

P. 6. 4. 48: अतो लोपः। (for चिकीर्षति etc.)

P. 6. 4. 49*: यस्य [अतो लोपः]। (for लोलुवः etc.)

P. 6. 4. 50*: [यस्य] हलः। (for बेभिदितुम् etc.)

योगविभागश्च लुको बाधनार्थमेव. This is the paraphrase of the *Mbh.*: किमर्थमिदम्? लुकं वक्ष्यति, तद्बाधनार्थम्.

The suggested rule यस्य [अतो लोपः] is a specific rule. If, following the opponent's view, यङोऽचि च is allowed to delete the whole cluster *ya*, then there will be no scope left whatsoever for the rule यस्य [अतो लोपः]. So it has to operate first, bringing about the *lopa*- elision of *a*. (The remaining *y* can then be deleted by यङोऽचि च.)

समानाश्रयो लुक् लोपेन बाध्यते —

This is a reply to the objection (against the योगविभाग proposed above), and also to the argument based on परत्व contained in the following *Mbh.*: इहापि तर्हि परत्वाद् योगविभागाद् वा लोपो लुकं बाधेत — 'कृष्णो नोनाव वृषभो यदीदम्' (ऋ. १. ७९. २)। The objection concerns the form नोनाव which comes from नू > नोनू + यङ् (deleted) + णल्. Here if *a* of *ya*(*ṅ*) is dropped first, either because of परत्व or योगविभाग, then the स्थानिवद्भाव will be there (i. e. *a* will be regarded as present there). When *a* is there, the *ū* of *nū* is no longer immediately preceding and so Vṛddhi (by P. 7. 2. 115) cannot take place. The reply to this objection is given in the *Mbh.* : समानाश्रयो लुक् लोपेन बाध्यते। कश्च समानाश्रयः ? यः प्रत्ययाश्रयः। अत्र च प्रागेव प्रत्ययोत्पत्तेर्लुग् भवति।

This reply stresses that the *lopa* will thus supersede *luk*, only when both have one and the same cause (as in the case of लोलुव, where the suffix is the cause of both लुक् and लोप). In the case of नोनाव, however, the cause of the *lopa* of *a* is an Ārdhadhātuka which follows, viz. *ṇal*, while there is *no* cause for *luk* — it is अनैमित्तिक as the *Prad.* says. So there is no danger of *luk* being superseded by *lopa* here.

तुल्यकालत्वात्. But, one may ask, why should *lopa* supersede *luk* only when the two are समानाश्रय ? — तुल्यकालत्वात्, replies the *Dīp.* When both are due to, say, one and the same following suffix, both present themselves simultaneously. At that time the *lopa* has an opportunity to supersede *luk* (either by reason of its परत्व or the योगविभाग) because the *luk* has yet to take effect. But in the case of नोनाव, the *luk* is simply without any cause. It takes place even before the suffix *ṇal* comes in. It is an अन्तरङ्ग operation. (...स निमित्तमनपेक्ष्यान्तरङ्गत्वात् प्रवर्तत एव as the *Dīp.* says.) Only after this, the suffix *ṇal* comes in, a बहिरङ्ग operation. The *luk* by that time is a *fait accompli*, and so *lopa* has no opportunity to supersede *luk*.

बहुलं छन्दसि. It is not certain whether according to Bhar. the whole rule (P. 2. 4. 73), or only the word बहुलम् from it, continues in P. 2. 4. 74 : यङोऽचि च. Kaiy. brings down only बहुलम्. Read : नोनावेत्यत्र बहुलग्रहणानुवृत्त्याऽनैमित्तिको ऽन्तरङ्गो लुक् प्रागेव प्रत्ययोत्पत्तेर्भवति.

ननु चातो लोपो ... नाश्रयणमिति. An objection and a reply. The अतो लोपः is taught in a general way. It does not require any particular Ārdhadhātuka to

follow. Any Ārdhadhātuka suffices for its application. So that rule also can equally take place even before the Ārdhadhātuka is there. In other words, अतो लोपः is also a sort of अनैमित्तिक, and therefore an अन्तरङ्ग, rule. So there is no guarantee that यञोऽचि च will operate first. If anything, अतो लोपः is a subsequent rule, and so is all the more qualified to operate first. In such an eventuality, there will be the prohibition of the Vṛddhi because of the स्थानिवद्भाव.

Two alternative replies are given : (1) अतो लोपः is not that अनैमित्तिक as it is made out to be by its advocate. It does require an Ārdhadhātuka in a general way. Another *nimitta* is the *adhikāra* अङ्गस्य (P. 6. 4. 1) which condition also has to be fulfilled. (2) Even that generality has to be present in the mind of the user of the linguistic form (बुद्धिसामान्यम्). For यङ्लुक् to operate, even this बुद्धिसामान्य is not necessary. So यञोऽचि च *is* अन्तरङ्ग in comparison with अतो लोपः.

[6]

निकुचितेऽप्युक्तम् । किम् ? संनिपात ... etc. So far it is shown that P. 1. 1. 4 can be dispensed with, since we can depend upon the स्थानिवद्भाव (of अल्लोप) to prevent the Guṇa and Vṛddhi substitutions. Now Pat. takes up a case where there is no अल्लोप and where, consequently, Guṇa will be due undesiredly, if P. 1. 1. 4 is not there. निकुचित is a case in point. It is derived from नि + कुन्च् + इत with the deletion of *n* by P. 6. 4. 24 : अनिदितां हल ... etc. Here after the elision of the radical nasal, there is a possibility that the ppl. suffix *ita* (<*iṭ* + *kta*) could be regarded optionally as *akit* by P. 1. 2. 21 : उदुपधाच्च भावादिकर्मणोरन्यतरस्याम्. If this option is excercised, an undesired Guṇa, resulting into **nikocita* would be imminent. There is no अल्लोप (or any other अजादेश). If P. 1. 1. 4 is done away with, how can we prevent the Guṇa ?

By way of reply, Pat. quotes the Pari. (85) : संनिपातलक्षणो विधिरनिमित्तं तद्विघातस्य. In the present case the deletion of the radical nasal has taken place as a result of the combination (संनिपात) —*n* + consonant + a '*kit*' *ita*. After this deletion of *n*, the radical *u* can be called *upadhā*. If taking advantage of this facility we bring in the rule P. 1. 2. 21 : उदुपधात् etc., then it will destroy — may be optionally — the *kit* character of the ppl. suffix -*kta*. Now it was this very *kit* character of *kta* which was responsible for the deletion of *n*. So the Pari. does not allow the operation of P. 1. 2. 21 which will destroy this *kit* character. In other words, *n*-, even when dropped, has to be regarded as being there — a kind of स्थानिवद्भाव. So the *kit* character of *ita* remains and gives scope to P. 1. 1. 5 : क्ङिति च to prevent the undesired Guṇa. So no harm even if P. 1. 1. 4 is dispensed with.

[7]

'यदि स्थानिवद्भावेन...युडचि क्ङिति' इति. The protagonist of P. 1. 1. 4 launches one more attack on the policy of taking recourse to the स्थानिवद्भाव. He mentions three cases where, he thinks, taking recourse to the स्थानिवद्भाव will result into wrong forms :

जङ्गमः. This is formed from जङ्गम्+यङ् (deleted)+अच् (P. 3. 1. 134). According to the objector, after *y* and *a* are dropped, the dropped *a* will be regarded as being there. So it could be said that a *ṅit* suffix (*aṅ*) follows the stem *jaṅgam*–. At this stage P. 6. 4. 98 : गमहनजनखनघसां लोपः क्ङित्यनङि will demand the elision of the penultimate *a*, resulting into the wrong form **jaṅgma-*.

यायाः. Formed from याया+यङ् (dropped)+अच् (the पचाद्यच्, P. 3. 1. 134). Here it is claimed by the objector that after *y* and *a* are dropped, the rule P. 6. 4. 64 : आतो लोप इटि च will require dropping of the radical *ā* because of the same element [*a*]*ṅ* following). The result will be the wrong form **yāya-* (from *yāy*+*a*(*c*).

देद्यः. Formed, again with the suffix *ac*, from the Intensive stem *dedī*. Thus देदी+यङ् (dropped)+अच्. Here it is claimed that after *y* and *a* are dropped, an element *y* (*yuṭ*) will come (by P. 6. 4. 63) between *dedī* and *a*, thus resulting into the wrong form **dedīya-*.

ननु च ... अनुवादित्वादर्थवत्त्वात्. This *Dīp*. discusses the objection with regard to जङ्गमः. The defendant expresses surprise at the objection. He points out that the very rule (P. 6. 4. 98) which teaches deleting of the radical penultimate when a vocalic suffix with the code-letter *k* or *ṅ* follows contains a proviso that this rule does not apply when the following suffix happens to be *aṅ* (*anaṅi* as the rule says). And here an *aṅ* follows. Where is then the possibility of such an eventuality in *jaṅgama*? It is now the turn of the objector to show surprise. 'But where, on earth, is the suffix *aṅ* in *jaṅgama*? We have *yaṅ*, no *aṅ*' (कथं पुनरयमङ् यावता यङत्र उपदिश्यते), says he. He then anticipates a possible clever interpretation by the defendant. 'Oh, perhaps your idea is that *y* is dropped *first*, so that what remains of *yaṅ* is *aṅ*. But even so it is of no avail. For, this *aṅ* is meaningless and it does not answer to the *aṅ* mentioned in P. 6. 4. 98 (अथापि यकारापगमे स्यात्, एवमपि अनर्थकोऽयम्). The basis for this argument is the Pari. (14) अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्य which prohibits the application of a rule to a meaningless sound sequence when a meaningful sound sequence is there which can properly be the subject of that operation. अथेह कथं प्रतिषेधः अगमदिति is a counter-question put by the defendant. How do you then account for the absence of the deletion of the penultimate in *agamat* where *aṅ*

is equally meaningless? If a meaningless *aṅ* can prevent an उपधालोप there, it can do so in *jaṅgama* also.' The objector now shows the difference between the two *aṅ*-s. The *aṅ* in *yaṅ* is meaningless because there the real meaningful unit is *yaṅ*, an Intensive suffix. After the initial *y* is removed, the truncated remainder *aṅ* is naturally meaningless. The *aṅ* in *agamat* on the other hand is a suffix, an Aor. marker, and so has a sort of meaning. True, it has no independent meaning of its own. But it sort of helps or confirms or supports (*anuvad-*) the finite ending (*tiṅ*) in conveying its meaning viz. the agent etc. So *anaṅi* can apply to *aṅ*, the Aor. sign, but not to -*aṅ*, the truncated part of *yaṅ*. The elision of the penultimate is inevitable in *jaṅgama* — यदि स्थानिवद्भावेन योगः प्रत्याख्यायते.

There is no discussion on *yāyā*- and *dedya*-. Apparently the objections in their case also have been sustained in the *Dīp*.

किं च स्थानिनि कार्यं दृष्टम् ... लुप्ते प्रवर्तेरन् ? — The advocate of P. 1. 1. 4 continues. He objects to the whole procedure followed by the opponent in taking his stand on the स्थानिवद्भाव and then refuting the rule P. 1. 1. 4. His basic argument is like this: A *lopa* substitute can bring about only such operations as could be effected when the *sthānin* was there (स्थानिनि कार्यं दृष्टमादेशेऽतिदिश्यते). You cannot effect such operations also as could not be effected when the *sthānin* was present. To take the example of *loluva*- (which the advocate of the स्थानिवद्भाव wants to account for on the strength of the स्थानिवद्भाव): Could *uvaṅ* come in as a substitute for the radical *ū* when *a* was actually there? No (न चाकारे कार्याणि दृश्यन्ते।). Since the consonant *y* intervened between *ū* and *a* there was no scope for *uvaṅ* to replace *ū*. (It is to be remembered that the advocate of the योगविभाग and स्थानिवद्भाव in the *Mbh.* consistently claims that अतो लोपः takes place first, and यलोप only afterwards.) It is too much to expect *a* to do something after its elision what it could not do when it was alive.

एवं च सति ... प्रतिषेधेन ? — The advocate of the स्थानिवद्भाव here points out that he is not doing anything new. He is just following in the footsteps of Pāṇini. He cites the case of the reading of *vare* in P. 1. 1. 51 (न पदान्तद्विर्वचनवरे ...) which, he thinks, indicates that even Pāṇini thought that operation which could not be done when a *sthānin* was there, could sometimes be done after its elision. To explain: In his rule 1. 1. 58 Pāṇini says, *inter alia*, that when the suffix *vara*(*c*) is to be affixed (P. 3. 2. 176: यश्च यङः) the *lopa* substitute of a vowel does not behave like its original. Why does Pāṇini make this rule? Because he was afraid that in the position याया + यङ् + वरच्, after the elision of *a* (by P. 6. 4. 48: अतो लोपः) and of *y* (by P. 6. 1. 66: लोपो व्योर्वलि) the deleted *a* could, on the strength of the स्थानिवद्भाव, be regarded as a suffix, further, with a code-letter *ṅ*, when it could thus be regarded that here was a

suffix which was *ajādi* and also *ṅit*, that provided an occasion for P. 6. 4. 64: आतो लोप इटि च which, if not restrained, would claim deletion of the radical *ā*, this resulting into an undesired form (*yāyāyavara* > **yāyāyvara* > **yāy-vara* > **yāvara*). When the स्थानिवद्भाव is denied, there is no such danger. (In the formation of *yāyāvara*, the *y* of the suffix *yaṅ* is dropped by P. 6. 1. 66: लोपो व्योर्वलि.)

तत्र पाणिनेरयमभिप्राय: ... प्रतिषेध आरभ्यते. A justification of Pāṇini's procedure with reference to P. 1. 1. 58 mentioned above. The justification is advanced on the basis of possibility (*sambhava*). In this case (of यायावर), *if* *y* is first elided, then there is a possibility of an element *aṅ* being physically present after *yāyā-*. This element can be designated as a *pratyaya* (on some such reasoning as एकदेशविकृतमनन्यवत्.) Since there is a possibility of the elision of the radical final when *aṅ* is there after it physically, there is equally a similar possibility on the basis of स्थानिवद्भाव, after *a* is elided. Hence the prohibition of स्थानिवद्भाव in connection with the suffix वर by Pāṇini.

यथैव लकारे कार्यमदृष्टमादेशे प्राप्नोति ... A parallel for the substitute receiving the operation of the elided original. The *lakāras* (i. e. *laṭ, liṭ, laṅ* etc.) which are taught in connection with different tenses and moods consist of *l* (which denotes agent etc. of the activity concerned) + a vowel for the facility of pronunciation + a code-letter *ṭ* or *ṅ* (for conveyiag certain incidental operations, undergone by the *tiṅ* endings.). Now *l* itself never undergoes any operations. It is replaced always by the concrete finite endings (*tiṅ*). Whatever operations become due are received by the finite substitutes. Then why are they taught, in the first instance, for *l* as such? Well, doesn't matter. If the original cannot undergo operations, its substitutes can.

इहापि संभवति सत्यवस्थानेऽकारस्य यकारापाये प्रत्ययत्वम्. The construction is इहापि यकारापाये (= प्रथमं यकारे लोपिते) अकारस्य अवस्थाने सति [तस्य अकारस्य] प्रत्ययत्वं संभवति। If you somehow delete the *y* first, then *-aṅ* remains. After you subsequently delete *a* also, one could regard, on the basis of the स्थानिवद्भाव, that a *pratyaya* (beginning with a vowel) is there. This explains why Pāṇini prohibits the स्थानिवद्भाव in the formation of यायावर.

वार्त्तिककारस्य तु कथं जङ्गमादय:? अस्यापि लुगिति। The sentence is obscure. अस्य=अस्य (वार्त्तिककारस्य) मते. Actually one does not know how the Vārttikakāra will find it difficult to arrive at the correct forms जङ्गम etc. In some cases (like बेभिदिता), Kāt. suggested utilising of स्थानिवद्भाव as an alternative for P. 1. 1. 4 in order to prevent the undesired Guṇa. In जङ्गम etc. there is no likelihood of any undesired Guṇa and so Kāt. does not come into the picture at all. — Further, अस्यापि लुक् seems prima facie to support the question. (*iti* = since). It obviously means that in his (Kāt.'s) view too, as in that of Pāṇini,

the *luk* is the substitute of the whole complex *ya*. But that is no reason for any difficulty on the part of Kāt. in explaining forms like जङ्गम. On the contrary, since there will be no अजादेश and no स्थानिवद्भाव, it follows that there is no suffix *aṅ* now following. Consequently there is no possibility whatsoever of उपधालोप becoming due in the case of जङ्गम in Kāt.'s view. For this reason, the following sentence : तेन यायः देदीयः ... etc. also becomes difficult to explain, since, by the same argument, there is no possibility of *ā-lopa* and the augment *yuṭ* in Kāt.'s view.

We therefore finally take अस्यापि लुगिति as a *reply* on behalf of the Vārttikakāra and supply a न before भवितव्यम्.

There is one more point. The interpretative trick of breaking the Sū. यस्य हलः in two rules originates expressly with Pat. We do not know whether Kāt. too had it in his mind. So if any undesired consequences (like the उपधालोप in जङ्गम) follow from such interpretation, we cannot hold Kāt. responsible for it.

But there is one thing. If Bhar. had raised the question about the difficulty of accounting forms like लोलुवः in Kāt.'s procedure, (say : वार्त्तिककारस्य तु कथं लोलुवादयः?), we would understand it. For, it does seem that with his rejection of P. 1. 1. 4 Kāt. cannot explain the *uvaṅ* substitute in such forms. The beauty of the situation is that whether you regard a *halacor ādeśa* as *sthānivat* or not, you cannot explain *uvaṅ* unless you accept P. 1. 1. 4. Thus, in the position लोलू + यङ् + अच्, when you have deleted *y* and *a*, if you say that स्थानिवद्भाव is there, then you have to accept that *y* intervenes between the radical *ū* and the suffix *a*(*ṅ*). Since *a*(*ṅ*) does not immediately follow, there cannot be *uvaṅ*. If, on the other hand, you say that there is no स्थानिवद्भाव, then the suffix *ac* follows immediately the verbal stem and Guṇa will be imminent. (This is no problem for Pāṇini, for he can deny the स्थानिवद्भाव and prevent the Guṇa by his rule 1. 1. 4). Read, in this connection, the *Mbh.* under P. 1. 1. 57 : *Vār*-s 14–19 [I. 149. 1–19] :

अथ हलचोरादेशः स्थानिवद्भवत्युताहो न। कश्चात्र विशेषः? 'हलचोरादेशः स्थानि-
वदिति चेद्विशते ..., (वा. १४)। ... 'यङ्लोपे यणियङुवङः' (वा. १८)। यङ्लोपे यणियङु-
वङो न सिध्यन्ति। चेच्यः नेन्यः, चेक्षियः चेक्रियः, लोलुवः लोलुपः। अचीति यणियङुवङो न
सिध्यन्ति। अस्तु तर्हि न स्थानिवत्। 'अस्थानिवत्त्वे यङ्लोपे गुणवृद्धिप्रतिषेधः' (वा. १९)।
अस्थानिवत्त्वे यङ्लोपे गुणवृद्ध्योः प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। लोलुवः पोपुवः, सरीसृपः मरीमृज इति।
नैष दोषः। 'न धातुलोप आर्धधातुके' इति प्रतिषेधो भविष्यति।

It is interesting to note that Kāt. does not raise the question : अथ हलचोरादेशः स्थानिवद्भवत्युताहो न when he discusses our Sū. (P. 1. 1. 4); raising it under P. 1. 1. 57 : अचः परस्मिन् पूर्वविधौ, he simply points out the drawbacks of

both the views when forms like लोलुव are concerned. He does not give any ruling. It is Pat. who adds that there is no harm if the स्थानिवद्भाव here is not accepted, because we can prevent the Guṇa by P. 1. 1. 4 (and, once Guṇa is prohibited, the way of *uvaṅ* is clear).

लोलुवादिषु त्वभ्युपगंस्यते ... etc. It is shown above that the formation of लोलुव is difficult to explain for Kāt. Bhar. therefore now says that with his rejection of P. 1. 1. 4, Kāt. will have no other way but to accept the स्थानिवद्भाव, depending on the (spacious) argument of *sambhava*.

* * *

P. 1. 1. 5 : *kṅiti ca*

[1]

This section discusses the question of the syntactical connection of *kṅiti* — whether it is connected with *ikaḥ*, or *guṇavṛddhī* (both these from P. 1. 1. 3) or with *na* (from P. 1. 1. 4).

गुणवृद्धी प्रतिषेधश्च ... प्रतिषेधेन भवितव्यम्. This *Dīp.* states that negation (प्रतिषेधः) is the principal factor (प्रधानम्), and as such it must be understood as qualified by *kṅiti*. True that neither *na* nor *guṇvṛddhī* is actually read in our rule; both are to be inferred (अनुमीयमानौ) as being present here by *anuvṛtti*. Still, it is the negation which is predicated (*vidhīyamāna-*) and as such constitutes the principal element. So it has the first claim to be qualified by *kṅiti*.

तेन क्ङितीति ... भवितव्यम् (*p.* 6, *l.* 7) points out an undesired consequence which follows from the above position. With the construction गुणवृद्धी क्ङिति न the rule would mean 'Guṇa and Vṛddhi do not (replace *ik*) when it precedes a *kit* or *ṅit* suffix immediately'. The element of immediateness comes in because the Loc. *kṅiti* gives an occasion to the Pari. : तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य (P. 1. 1. 66) which says that in such cases the operation affects only what immediately precedes. Therefore, in the present case the prohibition of Guṇa will apply only to cases like *cita-*, *stuta-* etc. (*ci* + *kta*, *stu* + *kta*); it will not apply to cases like *bhinna* (*bhid* + *kta* [>*na*]) etc. because here *i* does not immediately precede the *kit* suffix *kta*. In the *Dīp.*, the words न व्यवहितस्य are understood after ऽनन्तरस्य प्रतिषेधेन भवितव्यम्.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 7) स्यादेतद् .... The above difficulty is sought to be removed by proposing that *kṅiti* could be taken as qualifying both (उभयानुग्रहम्), *na* and also *guṇavṛddhī*, if it is taken as qualifying *guṇavṛddhī* primarily. The rule will now be : क्ङिति गुणवृद्धी क्ङिति न. Here क्ङिति गुणवृद्धी will mean ङिन्निमित्ते गुणवृद्धी. In all the cases of Guṇa and Vṛddhi, where this substitution

is caused by a Sārvadhātuka or an Ārdhadhātuka suffix, the substitution does not take place if that Sārvadhātuka or the Ārdhadhātuka suffix is *kṅit*. Thus, by taking *kṅiti* as *ubhayānugraha* and connecting it with *guṇavṛddhī*, we do not give an opportunity to the Pari. तस्मिन्निति ... to come in.

यथा स्त्रियामित्येतत् ... प्रातिपदिकस्य (*l.* 8) gives a parallel of उभयानुग्रह. P. 4. 1. 3 : स्त्रियाम् is explained as 'स्त्रीत्वं च प्रत्ययार्थः, प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणं चेत्युभयथापि युज्यते — स्त्रियामभिधेयायां स्त्रियां वा यत् प्रातिपदिकं वर्तते' (काशिका)। Here the प्रत्ययार्थ (स्त्रियामभिधेयायाम्) is principal; प्रकृत्यर्थ (or the प्रातिपदिक) is subordinate (गुणभूत). Still the latter is equally qualified by स्त्रियाम्. Similarly in our case also. गुणवृद्धी, though subordinate, is equally qualified (by *kṅiti*) as *na*.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 9) युक्तं हि ... प्रतिषेधविशेषणम्. The प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन् objects to the parallel. It is all right (युक्तम्) 'there'. उभयानुग्रह is possible there. It is not so here. We have to take *kṅiti* as a qualification of *na* (the *pratiṣedha*) only.

The *Dīp*. does not say why उभयानुग्रह may be justified there. The *Padam*. may be of some help to us. It says on the above mentioned *Kāś*. that the word *strī* has two meanings. It denotes (1) the pure quality of feminineness, as also (2) an individual possessed of it (स्त्रीशब्दोऽयं शुक्लादिशब्दवद् गुणमात्रे गुणिनि च वर्तते). Starting from this it explains how the expression *striyām* is both a प्रत्ययार्थ and also a प्रकृत्यर्थविशेषणम् (तत्र यदा गुणमात्रे स्त्रीशब्दो वर्तते, तदा द्रव्यवाचिनः प्रातिपदिकात् स्त्रीत्वेऽभिधेये टाबादयो भवन्तीति स्त्रीत्वं प्रत्ययार्थ इति पक्षो भवति। यदा तु स्त्रीत्वयुक्तं द्रव्यं स्त्रीशब्देनोच्यते तदा ... स्त्रीत्वमुपलक्षणं विशेषणं वेति।) Some such thing must have been meant by Bhar., but somehow he chooses not to expand on it. We have to understand the प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन् as saying that a twofold syntactical construction is justified in the case of *striyām* there because of the twofold meaning of the word *strī*. Here *kṅiti* has no such twofold meaning, and so उभयानुग्रह is out of question.

Observation : The phrase युक्तं तत्रोभयानुग्रहात् is a problem. What is the subject which goes with the predicate *yuktam* ? Actually *ubhayānugrahaḥ* is intended but that is ruled out grammatically. So तथा कर्तुं 'to do so' or some such word is to be supplied. उभयानुग्रहात्, in that case, means उभयानुग्रहसत्त्वात् or °ग्रहसामर्थ्यात्.

(*p.* 6, *l.* 10) ननु च गुणवृद्धि ... ऽर्थं पक्षः. An objection against the *pratiṣedha-viśeṣya* view and a reply to it. The गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् pleads that there is an advantage in taking *kṅiti* as a qualification of *guṇavṛddhī* in that the prohibition then can apply equally to both an immediate and also a mediate *ik* and thus gets a greater scope (महाविषयः). (We supply प्रतिषेधः which we take as qualified by महाविषयः.)

एतच्च न (*l*. 11) etc. refutes the above argument. The refutation is based on the parallel of the Śunaskarṇastoma sacrifice. When the death of the sacrificer occurs at a particular stage in the progress of the Śunaskarṇa sacrifice (which, it seems, is anticipated), then the sacrifice is terminated there and then, for, the sacrificer, the main party who is to benefit from it, is no longer there. The sacrifice is not continued just for the benefit of the subordinate elements (*aṅgānām*). ' The more, the merrier ' is not the rule here. Similarly in our case also, if the prohibition (which is the basic thing), because of its being qualified by *kṅiti* gets only a small number of cases (viz. where *ik* precedes immediately a *kṅit* suffix) where absence of Guṇa can be accounted for, its all right. Doesn't matter. This main element has only a specific expectation (**विशिष्टविषया ... प्रधानमर्थि**), and as long as that expectation is fulfilled, it's all right, we should not run after a subordinate member, just in pursuit of a higher number of achievements.

शुनस्कर्णस्तोम — An *ekāha* sacrifice of the Agniṣṭoma type, this is one of the nine *rājayajñas* (the others being Rājasūya, Aśvamedha, Puruṣamedha etc.). This is so named after Śunaskarṇa who was the first to perform it.[1] (He was a Vārṣṇyaka acc. to *JBr.*, a Bāṣkiha acc. to *TāṇBr.*, and a Śaibya acc. to *BauŚrauSū.*). He is described as a very virtuous king who wanted to die (and go to heaven) before he committed any sin.[2] Hence it is laid down that one who wants to go to heaven undefiled by sin may perform this sacrifice.[3] The *TāṇBr.* and the *ĀpŚrSū.* also say that one who desires to die (and go to heaven) while one is in complete health may also perform this sacrifice.[4] The *BauŚrSū.* also says that this sacrifice may be performed to bring about the death of one's enemy (or of the enemy of one's protegé).[5]

A significant part in this ritual is that when the Ārbhavapavamāna (yajñāyajñīya acc. to another tradition) is being chanted in the third pressing of the Soma the sacrificer goes to the south of the Audumbarī (acc. to another accounts ; of the Gārhapatya, or of the Āhavanīya), covers himself with a new cloth in a

---

1. एतेन वै शुनस्कर्णो बाष्किहोऽयजत, तस्माच्छुनस्कर्णस्तोम इत्याख्यायते।
(**ताण्ड्यब्रा**. १७. १२)

2. शुनस्कर्णो ह वार्ष्णकः ... स ह चकमे, पुण्यमेवास्मिँल्लोके कृत्वापापंकृत्य स्वर्गं लोकं गच्छेयमिति (**जै**. २. १६७-१६८)। शुनस्कर्णो ह वै शैब्यो राजा पुण्यकृद् बहुयाज्यास। स ह ... ऋत्विजः पप्रच्छ। अस्ति स्वित् स यज्ञक्रतुर्येनाहमिष्ट्वैव प्रयायामिति (**बौश्रौसू**. १८. ४८)।

3. स यः पुण्यकृत् कामयेत पुण्यमेवास्मिँल्लोके कृत्वापापंकृत्य स्वर्गं लोकं गच्छेयमिति स एतेन यजेत (**जैब्रा**. तत्रैव)।

4. यः काममेतानामयतामुं लोकमियामिति स एतेन यजेत (**ताण्ड्यब्रा**. तत्रैव)। मरणकामो यजेत। यः कामयेतानामयता स्वर्गं लोकमियामिति (**आपश्रौसू**. २२. ७. २१)।

5. यं द्विष्यात् तस्यैवं यज्ञं कुर्यात्, उपसृतं वा याजयेत् (**बौश्रौसू**. १८. ४८).

particular way, and asking the priests to conclude the sacrifice, lies down for good.[1] (For technical details, see *JBr.* 2. 167, 168, *TāṇḍyaBr.* 17. 12, *BauŚrauSū.* 18. 48, 24. 11, *ĀpaŚrauSū.* 22. 7. 20–25.)

(*p.* 6, *l.* 13) ननु च प्रतिषेधविशेषणेऽपि ... etc. The गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् now launches his attack from a different angle. One might admit that technically *kṅiti* should be a qualification of *na* which lays down the prohibition. Practically, however, it is *guṇavṛddhī* which come to be finally qualified by *kṅiti*. For it is always some *process* (क्रिया) that is enjoined or prohibited. In the present case also, the prohibition concerns the activity of *substitution* of Guṇa and Vṛddhi. A *pratiṣedha* makes no sense without a *pratiṣedhya*. — The *Dīp.* यद्यप्येवं तथापि ... etc. (*l.* 15) replies this argument. It is true, the प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन् says, that everywhere activity is taught. Still (यद्यप्येवं), it is not of the nature of a process (*sādhya*, as it is elsewhere called), but of the nature of existence (सत्तासादृश्यमापन्ना; in other words, सिद्धा). Our rule therefore, according to him, is not to be interpreted as क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी ते न भवतः, but as क्ङिति (परतः) गुणवृद्ध्योः सत्ता न (as the *Dīp.* puts it: सत्तायां गुणवृद्धी विशेषणं न निवृत्तौ).

(*p.* 6, *l.* 16) एवमपि प्रतिषेधे ... etc. contains the last objection by the गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् and its rebuttal by the प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन्. The गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् again shifts his attack. The opponent wants somehow to bring in the Pari. तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य (with the consequence that व्यवहितप्रतिषेध cannot be achieved). But that is not possible for the simple reason that there can be no immediacy (of a *kṅit* suffix) with prohibition. Such a relation is possible between the *kṅiti* suffix and some stem-element only. The reply is given in गुणवृद्धिविशेषणेऽपि ... etc. It is pointed out by the प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन् that as far as the *ānantarya* is concerned the opponent's view fares no better. There cannot be *ānantarya* even between the *kṅit* suffix and the Guṇa-Vṛddhi because the Guṇa-Vṛddhi have yet to come into being. You cannot speak of a relation like *ānantarya* with something which does not exist (अनभिनिर्वृत्ते पूर्वपरव्यवहारस्य कर्तुमशक्यत्वात् as Nāg. says).

तस्माद् गुणवृद्धिविशिष्टः (*l.* 18) etc. gives the conclusion. The present rule which prohibits Guṇa-Vṛddhi (गुणवृद्धिविशिष्टः प्रतिषेधः = गुणवृद्ध्योः प्र°) is sort of a perfection (*saṁskāra*) of *ik* (which is the *sthānin* for Guṇa-Vṛddhi according to P. 1. 1. 3) which keeps its form intact (from the substitution). But once *ik* thus comes in, the *ānantarya* is possible, and the difficulty of the prohibition not applying to forms like *bhinna* (where *ik* is *vyavahita*) confronts us. That is why, Bhar. says, Kāt. suggests तन्निमित्तग्रहणम्.

---

1. आर्भवे स्तूयमाने दक्षिणेनौदुम्बरीं पत्तोदशेनाहतेन वाससा दक्षिणाशिखः प्रावृतः संविशन्नाह—ब्राह्मणाः समापयत मे यज्ञमिति । तदैव संतिष्ठते (आपश्रौसू. २२. ७. २४, २५)।

[1. 1]

The full text of this *Vār*. (1) and the *Mbh*. on it is as follows : 'क्ङिति प्रतिषेधे तन्निमित्तग्रहणम्' (वा. १) । क्ङिति प्रतिषेधे तन्निमित्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । क्ङिन्निमित्ते ये गुणवृद्धी प्राप्नुतस्ते न भवत इति वक्तव्यम् । (followed by किं प्रयोजनम्? 'उपधारोरवीत्यर्थम्' (वा. २) etc.) In the *Dīp*. नायं पाठः ... न भवत इति, Bhar. says that one should not misunderstand the *Vār*. Kāt. does not mean that the word *nimitta* should be actually read (नायं पाठः) in the rule (something like *क्ङिन्निमित्ते च instead of क्ङिति च). All that he means is that the expression *kṅiti* (in the Locative) should be so explained (grammatically) that it will result into 'caused by *kṅit*'. — पठितव्यम् is rather a loose expression, meaning *vyākhyeyam* 'to be interpreted'. (The *vyākhyāna* probably consists in understanding the Loc. in *kṅiti* as taught by P. 2. 3. 37 : 'यस्य च भावेन भावलक्षणम्'. क्ङिति सति ये गुणवृद्धी ultimately means क्ङिन्निमित्ते ये गुणवृद्धी.)

(*p*. 6, *l*. 22) भाष्यकारो निमित्त..etc. Here the *Dīp*. shows how Pat. understands the *Vār*. differently. Pat. thinks that Kāt. wants that the word *nimitta* be inserted (निमित्तग्रहणमपूर्वं कर्तव्यम्) in the rule itself, cf. the *Mbh*. क्ङिति प्रतिषेधे तन्निमित्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्, which is the paraphrase of the *Vār*. — अन्ये तु ... etc. gives the other interpretation which Bhar. has first given (and which he obviously follows). निमित्तग्रहणं व्याख्येयम्=निमित्तार्थो यथा निष्पद्येत तथा निमित्तशब्दमपठित्वैव व्याख्येयम्.

In this interpretation of others, *kṅiti* is to be understood as qualifying *guṇavṛddhī* (=क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी विहिते ते न भवतः, *Dīp. p*. 7, *ll*. 5-6). Once you take *kṅiti* thus as qualifying *guṇa-vṛddhi*, the metarule P. 1. 1. 66 : तस्मिन्निति ... etc. ceases to be operative here.

(*p*. 6, *l*. 25) परिभाषा विध्यङ्गभूतत्वात् ... etc. This explains the difference made by the difference in construction. When you say क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी विहिते ते न भवतः, the Locative in क्ङिति is not a *parasaptamī*, as there is no injunction as such. A Pari. presents itself when some operation concerned is taught as a process (यत्र विधीयते); not when some *fait accompli* (सिद्ध-) is merely mentioned in connection with something else (अन्यार्थमुपादीयते).

In support of this statement the *Dīp*. quotes a parallel : P. 1. 1. 73 : वृद्धिर्यस्याचामा ... etc. Although the word *vṛddhiḥ* occurs here, P. 1. 1. 3 : इको गुणवृद्धी does not interfere here, because the rule does not teach a Vṛddhi substitution. It mentions a Vṛddhi sound which is already there. (This is in accordance with the Pari. [93. 10] विधौ परिभाषोपतिष्ठते नानुवादे. Bhar. does not quote the Pari. as such, but only its content.)

(*p*. 7, *l*. 2) ज्ञापकं च ··· मा भूदिति. As a *jñāpaka* for the above Pari. the *Dīp*. mentions the use of the word *sthāne* in P. 7. 3. 46 : उदीचामातः स्थाने

यकपूर्वायाः. This Sū. says that according to the Northerners, *i* is substituted, when the fem. suffix *āp* follows, *in the place of a* which has replaced *ā*, preceded by *y* or *k* and which is followed by a suffixal *k*. (Thus we have *caṭakikā* (< *caṭakakā*. Here first *caṭakā*>*caṭaka* (P. 7. 4. 13 : केऽणः) when the suffix *ka* taught in P. 5. 3. 70 : प्रागिवात् कः follows).

This *jñāpaka* is to be explained thus : In P. 7. 3. 46, अतः (continued from 7. 3. 44) is the *uddeśya* and इत् is the *vidheya*. आतः स्थाने qualifies अत्. Now, if the Pari. विधौ परिभाषा ... etc. was not there, where was the need for actually reading the word स्थाने in P. 7. 3. 46 ? आतः would have automatically meant आतः स्थाने by P. 1. 1. 49 : षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा. The reading of स्थाने in P. 7. 3. 46 would then be superfluous. This apparent superfluousness can be explained only on the hypothesis that elsewhere a Pari. operates only in the *vidheya* part, not in the *uddeśya* or the *anuvāda* part of an injunctive rule. Cf. the *Kāś.* on this rule : स्थानग्रहणमनुवादेऽपि स्थानसंबन्धप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम्. On this the *Padam.* : स्थानग्रहणमनर्थकम्, 'षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा' इति सिद्धत्वादिति । अत आह — स्थानग्रहणमित्यादि । परिभाषाया विधिशेषत्वादनुवादे उपस्थानं न स्यादिति भावः ।

Observation — In his *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, however, Nāg. has refuted this Pari. on the grounds that it has no support of the *Mbh.*, that it has many exceptions, and that the *jñāpaka* can be explained otherwise (Kiel. *p.* 177, *l.* 9 — 178. 3).

(*p.* 7, *l.* 3) षष्ठीनिर्देशे ... मा भूदिति. We have retained अस्थानेयोगनिमित्तः of the eds. Actually the letters are blurred in the MS., and we do not know how to interpret the sentence even if अस्थानेयोगनिमित्तः proves to be the original text.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 4) विहितयोरन्यत्रभूतयोः ... is doubtful. The sentence obviously means : *kṅiti* is read here in a rule which is different from rules where Guṇa and Vṛddhi substitutions are actually taught (i. e. where Guṇa and Vṛddhi are predicates, not subjects). — क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी विहिते ते न भवतः (*ll.* 5–6) spells out the Sūtra according to the *guṇavṛddhiviśeṣya* view while the preceding sentence इत्यनुपस्थानादनन्तरपरिभाषायाः ... etc. states the result. Finally, क्ङिति प्रतिषेधे नास्ति निमित्तपरिग्रहः (*l.* 6) concludes the presentation of this view which began with अन्ये तु (*p.* 6, *l.* 23) etc.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 6) एतत्तु नोपपद्यते, प्रतिषेधस्य प्राधान्यात्. Objection by the प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन्. He naturally objects to the interpretation which connects *kṅiti* with *guṇavṛddhī*.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 7) अर्थेऽन्तर्भूतस्य ... etc. A retort by the opponent. After all neither *na* nor *guṇavṛdddī* is directly read in P. 1. 1. 5. Both are to be inferred as continued in this rule as required by the context. If both are merely implied because of the consideration of the topic (अर्थेऽन्तर्भूतस्य), why should the other man be so keen on favouring the prohibition, to the exclusion of *guṇavṛddhī* ?

Observation : प्रतिषेधानुग्रहे न is our emendation of °ग्रहेण (of the MS. and also of AL and Sw). It at once imparts a meaning to न पुनर्, gives a balance to the whole sentence (°नुग्रहे ... नुग्रहे) and makes the sentence-meaning somewhat clear. The MS °ग्रहेण may have been an emendation by a learned scribe who mistook the original °ग्रहे न to be instrumental and so 'corrected' the MS by effecting cerebralization.

(*p*. 7, *l*. 8) तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे ... etc. The प्रतिषेधविशेष्यवादिन् explains. The present rule (एतत्) is a legitimate domain of the Pari. तस्मिन्निति ... etc. To counteract its undesired effects, the word *nimitta* has simply to be understood in the rule.

Observation : The *Dīp*. अर्थेऽन्तर्भूत ... वृद्धिविशेषणे (*p*. 7, *ll*. 7-13) is not clear. We ourselves are not satisfied with the reconstruction and interpretation of the text. Therefore, both the text and the translation of this passage should be taken as tentative and open to correction.

[2]

उपधार्थं रोरवीत्यर्थं च. The *Dīp*. explains उपधार्थम् by उपधाया व्यवहितार्थम्. It means व्यवहिताया अपि उपधाया यथा गुणवृद्धिप्रतिषेधः स्यात्. If *nimitta* is not read, then the अनन्तरपरिभाषा will prevent P. 1. I. 5 from applying to cases like *bhinna* where the *ik* does not immediately precede the *kit* suffix *kta*. If, however, *kṅiti* is understood as *nimittasaptamī*, there is no scope for the *anantara* Paribhaṣā. *Bhinna* is accounted for.

रोरवीति is Intensive (without *-ya*) from *ru* 'cry'. It is formed thus: *ru* (>*ruru* P. 6. 1. 9, >*roru* P. 7. 4. 82, >*roro*, P. 7. 3. 84, >*rorav*, P. 6. 1. 78) + *yaṅ* (dropped, P. 2. 4. 74) + *śap* (dropped P. 2. 4. 72) + *ti* (>*īti*, P. 7. 3. 94). Here (इतरत्र=रोरवीति इत्यत्र), unless *nimitta* is read, *kṅiti* will undesiredly prevent the Guṇa, since *yaṅ* (a *ṅit* suffix) immediately follows the radical *ik*. The reading of *nimitta* will prevent P. 1. 1. 5 from applying, since *yaṅ* is not the cause (*nimitta*) of Guṇa (अत्र हि तिब्निमित्तो गुणः, न यङ्निमित्तः as Kaiy. says). The *nimittagrahaṇa* thus serves a double purpose, a positive and a negative one.

(*p*. 7, *l*. 15) यत्रैव क्ङित्यनन्तरो गुणभाव्यस्ति[1] इति. This is in reply to the question : किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति ? The full text is thus : क्ङितीत्युच्यते। तेन यत्र क्ङित्यनन्तरो गुणभाव्यस्ति, तत्रैव स्यात् — चितम्, स्तुतम्। इह तु न स्यात् — भिन्नः, भिन्नवानिति। — The adjective गुणभावी qualifies इक् which is understood (P. 1. 1. 3). — The next sentence गुणभार्याप्रतिषेधेनोतर्यभावात् (*l*. 16) is corrupt in the MS. AL read it as गुणभाविप्रतिषेधेऽनान्तर्याभावात्, Sw as गुणभावी(क्)प्रतिषेधे(आ)नंतर्या-

1. गुणभावीगस्ति in the Jhajjar ed.; also in Sw's *Dīp*. as गुणभावी (इग्) अस्ति.

भावात्. भार्या of the MS is evidently corrupt for भावी, but whether भावी itself is genuine, or a wrong writing by the scribe under the influence of the *Mbh.* expression is problematic. Actually it serves no purpose here. If the following *Dīp.* is any clue, the text should have been गुणवृद्धिभ्यां प्रतिषेधेन चानन्तर्याभावात् or some such thing. The *Dīp.* यथेह 'इको यणचि' — etc. explains why the *Mbh.* brings in *guṇabhāvī* (i. e. *ik*). Immediacy (आनन्तर्यम्) — as required by the locative *kṅiti* according to P. 1. 1. 66 — is possible neither with *na* (it appears in the grammatical rule, not in the actual examples) nor with *guṇavṛddhī* (they are yet to come in) which come down by *anuvṛtti*. इको यणचि is a वैधर्म्येण दृष्टान्तः. — गुणप्रवृत्तिम् ... etc. is an incidental question : why does Pat. mention only Guṇa (in *guṇabhāvī*) alone, ignoring Vṛddhi? Why does he not give an example where, in the absence of *nimitta*, a Vṛddhi will not be undesiredly prohibited, or, on the other hand, will be prohibited where it is desired? The root *mṛj* with its penultimate *ṛ* could be a good example of the desired Vṛddhi becoming unavailable, suggests this *Dīp.* — अयमभिप्रायः etc. gives the reply. The reason (अभिप्रायः) for not quoting *mṛj* as a case of Vṛddhi is that P. 1. 1. 5 does not apply to it. According to one interpretation of P. 7. 2. 113, 114 the word *acaḥ* (of 7. 2. 114) is to be connected with the preceding rule (i. e. 7. 2. 113 : मृजेर्वृद्धिः). The resulting rule now is मृजेर्वृद्धिरचः. The result is, that since the स्थानिन् (viz. अचः) of the Vṛddhi substitute is now directly mentioned, the Vṛddhi ceases to be *iglakṣaṇa*, as a further result of while P. 1. 1. 5 does not apply to it. Read : वृद्धिप्रतिषेधानुपपत्तिस्त्विक्प्रकरणात् (वा. १०)। वृद्धेस्तु प्रतिषेधो नोपपद्यते। किं कारणम्? इक्प्रकरणात्। इग्लक्षणयोर्गुणवृद्ध्योः प्रतिषेधः। न चैवं सति मृजेरिग्लक्षणा वृद्धिर्भवति। तस्मान् मृजेरिग्लक्षणा वृद्धिरेषितव्या। एवं तर्हि ... योगविभागः करिष्यते — 'मृजेर्वृद्धिरचो' भवति। (ततः 'अचि क्ङिति' ... etc.) (*Mbh.* I. 48. 5–12).

Observation : In *l.* 19, the MS reads : तत्र स्थानी वृद्धेर्वृद्धिर्. We insert मृजेर् between वृद्धेर् and वृद्धिर् to make the idea clear and also to bring it in line the *Mbh.* (quoted above).

[2. 1]

(*p.* 7, *l.* 21) ननु च यस्य गुण उच्यते. This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh.* : ननु च यस्य गुण उच्यते, तं क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेषयिष्यामः। पुगन्तलघूपधस्य चाङ्गस्य[1] गुण उच्यते, तच्चात्र क्ङित्परम्। The opponent says that even accepting that immediacy is necessary (for the substitution or prohibition of Guṇa), reading of *nimitta* is not necessary. The prohibition of Guṇa in *bhinna* can be accounted for by taking *aṅga* as the *sthānin* qualifying it by *kṅiti*. After all, the primary *sthānin* of Guṇa is the *aṅga* (P. 6. 4. 1 : अङ्गस्य). And there *is* immediacy between the *aṅga* here viz. *bhid-* and the suffix *kta*. The pertinent rule P. 7. 3. 86

1. Kielhorn does not read अङ्गस्य.

पुगन्तलघूपधस्य can qualify अङ्गस्य. Thus : क्ङिति परत: पुगन्तस्य अङ्गस्य लघूपधस्य चाङ्गस्य गुण: न स्यात्. Even on the condition of immediacy the Guṇa is now legitimate, and so equally its prohibition. *Nimittagrahaṇa* is not necessary.

(*p.* 7, *l.* 21) कथं पुनरसंशब्दितमप्रकृतं ... etc. An objection against the above argument. असंशब्दितम्, not mentioned directly (in P. 1. 1. 5). अप्रकृतम्, not available by *adhikāra* or *anuvṛtti*. आश्रयितुम् = क्ङिति इत्यस्य विशेष्यत्वेन आश्र°. — यदि च गुणभूतस्य ... etc. The गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् loses no time in administering the taunt. The *Dīp.* यत्तावदुच्यते ... etc. (*l.* 23) refutes the objection. सामर्थ्यम्— syntactic and semantic relationship, capacity to fulfil an expectation (आकाङ्क्षा) raised by another word. Another justification is that the term *pratyaya* is a relative one and it automatically implies *aṅga* (cf. P. 1. 4. 13 : यस्मात् प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्ययेऽङ्गम्). Kaiy. almost repeats the *Dīp.* verbatim.

यच्चोच्यते गुणवृद्धिविशेषणे (*l.* 27) ... etc. A reply to the 'को मत्सर:' taunt Even if we say क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी ते न भवत:, the prohibition will not apply to *bhinna* etc., that is the reason, and no *matsara*. The passage which explains the argument, at least its initial part, is not very clear, being clumsily worded and the confusion is worse confounded by some scribal errors. We propose the following emendations : (1) (*l.* 28). For भूतोपांगानतर्ये of the MS we read भूतेऽपि यण्यानन्तर्ये which would balance भूतयोरपि गुणवृद्ध्यो:. We similarly follow the MS and read भूतयोरपि (*p.* 8, *l.* 1) which Sw reads as श्रुतयोरपि. (Sw reads श्रुतोपाङ्गानन्तर्ये. AL come nearer when they read भूतयणान°). (2) With Sw we insert a न after तत्र (*p.* 8, *l.* 3). (3) The MS reads [ए]व भूतस्य in (*p.* 8, *ll.* 3–4). We do not know what to make of भूतस्य (in spite of two occurrences of this word *bhūta-* above in this passage, AL retain it : Sw reads एवंभूतस्य, though एवं hardly contributes towards making the idea clear. We would like simply to ignore it.

Now to the argument : It was claimed by the गुणवृद्धिविशेष्यवादिन् that if क्ङिति is made to qualify गुणवृद्धी, (i. e. क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी, ते न भवत:), that would make the reading of निमित्त unnecessary. क्ङिति in that case will not be a परसप्तमी, and so there will be no occasion for the अनन्तरपरिभाषा to step in. It is now claimed that that is not true. The door still remains open for the अनन्तरपरिभाषा. When you say क्ङिति गुणवृद्धी the possibility of its meaning 'गुणवृद्धी immediately followed by क्ङित्' is still there. And if गुणवृद्धी are to be immediately followed by *kṅit*, their potential original, the *ik*, also has to immediately precede the गुणवृद्धी. This is on the analogy of the rule इको यणचि (P. 6. 1. 77). Here both the original, the *ik*, and also the substitute, the *yaṇ*, are equally characterised by immediacy (*ānantarya*) with the following *ac*. Similarly if *kṅiti* is to prohibit a Guṇa or a Vṛddhi, their potential original, the *ik*, will have to be immediately preceding (व्यवहिते नैव प्राप्नोति ।... इति स एव दोषो य: प्रतिषेधविशेषणे). Hence ... पुगन्तलघूपधस्यैवानन्तर्यमाश्रयितव्यम्. That gives scope to the

anantara-paribhāṣā, giving this interpretation (अयमर्थः संपन्नः) : क्ङित्यनन्तरे पुगन्तलघूपधस्य गुणो न भवति. The cases like *bhinna* are accounted for, and there is no need to read *nimitta* in the rule.

(*p*. 8, *l*. 5) अङ्गस्येति च नोक्तम् ... etc. An incidental remark. Obviously there was no अङ्गस्य after पुगन्तलघूपधस्य in the *Mbh*. text used by Bhar. He tries to account for this absence in the *Dīp*. नाङ्गमात्रं गुणभाक् etc. He seems to say that अङ्गस्य is not read here because that would have meant that each and every *aṅga*, which is *pugantalaghūpadha*, is here mentioned as undergoing Guṇa. This would have given a wrong idea of the view here presented. The qualification सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः of the *aṅga* has to be there. In order to avoid confusion, Bhar. seems to say, Pat. has not used the word अङ्गस्य.

Observations : (1) Some MSS of the *Mbh*. read अङ्गस्य after पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च while others read it only on margin. (See Kielhorn's पाठभेदाः, *Mbh*. I. 507. col. 1, *ll*. 16, 17). As regard the editions, Nirṇ. and Jhajjar editors read it, but not Kielhorn, and following him Mm. Vasudevashastri Abhyankar (but the latter adds the word *aṅga* in his Marathi translation).

(2) One can reasonably suppose that Bhar.'s *Mbh*. text did not read अङ्गस्य. Hence his remark : अङ्गस्येति च नोक्तम्. This is, of course, based on the assumption that the MS अ(i. e. अं)गस्येति च नोक्तं (also adopted by Sw) is correct. AL read the MS (or emend it) as अङ्गस्येति तत्रोक्तम्. They probably depend on the Nirṇ. and Jhajjhar editions and reject नोक्तं because they thought that it contradicted the *Mbh*. But उक्तम् (i. e. तत्रोक्तम्) contradicts with the following *Dīp*. itself which apparently explains why the *Mbh*. does not read अङ्गस्य here.

(3) It is significant that Kaiy. also does not mention *aṅga* here. He too, like Bhar, mentions *aṅga* only in the alternative explanation (अथ वा, क्ङितीति प्रत्ययग्रहणात् प्रत्ययेनाङ्गं संनिधाप्यते which is almost identical with the *Dīp*. अथ वा क्ङितीति प्रत्ययग्रहणे सति अङ्गमपि संनिहितम्). For him too, mere लघूपधस्य suffices for the आकाङ्क्षा argument. Read : आकाङ्क्षया पुगन्तलघूपधस्येति संनिधानं मन्यते। तथा हि, 'क्ङिति गुणवृद्धी न भवतः' इत्युक्ते 'कस्य ?' इत्याकाङ्क्षायां यस्य प्राप्ते इत्यस्ति पुगन्तलघूपधस्यापेक्षा।

(4) But with all this, whether the *Mbh*. here actually reads the word अङ्गस्य or not, there is no doubt that अङ्गस्य has to be understood after पुगन्तलघूपधस्य. This is for three reasons : (i) In the interpretation under discussion in the *Mbh*., लघू° is a Bahuvrīhi. It is therefore adjective, and so requires a substantive which is none else than अङ्गस्य. (The other view, that लघू° is a Dvandva is yet to come.) (ii) In the context of *ānantarya*, which is the issue involved here, only an *aṅga* can precede immediately the suffix, not the पुगन्तः or the लघ्वी उपधा. (iii) The following *Mbh*. itself refers to अङ्गस्य in this context.

(*p.* 8, *l.* 6) पुगन्तलघूपधस्येति नैवं विज्ञायते. The तन्निमित्तग्रहणवादिन् in the *Mbh.* refutes the above arguments. The full text of the *Mbh.* runs thus : पुगन्तलघूपधस्येति नैवं विज्ञायते — पुगन्तस्याङ्गस्य लघूपधस्य चेति। कथं तर्हि? पुकि अन्तः पुगन्तः लघ्वी उपधा लघूपधा। पुगन्तश्च लघूपधा च पुगन्तलघूपधम्। अवश्यं चैतदेवं विज्ञेयम्। अङ्गविशेषणे हि सति इहापि प्रसज्येत — भिनत्ति, छिनत्तीति। (This is the second occurrence of this *Mbh.* passage which has first occurred under P. 1. 1. 3 [*Mbh.* I. 47. 6-9]). The *Mbh.* here says that *laghūpadhā* (a *karmadhāraya*) has become *-laghūpadha* in a Samābāra Dvandva. All that the rule says, therefore, is that a Guṇa is substituted in the place of a light penultimate (belonging to the *aṅga*, of course), since Guṇa is taught for the light penultimate (and not for the *aṅga*), and since, by its very nature, a penultimate cannot immediately precede the *kṅit* suffix, the rule is unable to prohibit the Guṇa in *bhinna*. The reading of *tannimitta* is necessary. — In the *Dīp.* (*l.* 7) *samudāyaḥ* refers to the whole *aṅga* while *avayavaḥ* refers to its part, *ik*.

[2. 2]

(*p.* 8, *l.* 9) शचङन्ते दोषः. An objection against the तन्निमित्तग्रहण. Kāt. is going to give a reply to an objection which will be taken against the तन्निमित्तग्रहण view. Pat. puts the objection thus : यदि तन्निमित्तग्रहणं क्रियते, शचङन्ते दोषः। रियति, पियति, धियति। प्रादुद्रुवत्, प्रासुस्रुवत्। अत्र प्राप्नोति। The point raised in the *Mbh.* here is that in forms made with the Vikaraṇa *śa* (*riyati* etc. from the root *ri*, *pi* and *dhi* respectively [P. Dh. VI. 111-113], and *prādudruvat* etc. (Aor. with *caṅ*, P. 3. 1. 48) you cannot prevent Guṇa if *tannimitta* is read in the rule. The *śa* is *kṅit* (P. 7. 3. 84 : सार्वधातुकमपित्) and it will prevent the Guṇa taught by P. 7. 3. 86 : सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः. But it cannot prevent the Guṇa (in connection with *-tip*) taught by P. 7. 3. 86 : पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च, because the Guṇa is not caused by *śa*. The same applies to Guṇa of radical *dru* in *adudruvat*. — अतन्निमित्तः = ङिङ्भिन्ननिमित्तः. (The MS reads अनिमित्तो which is evidently corrupt. Sw emends it into तिङ्निमित्तो. We follow AL and read अतन्निमित्तो as it is nearer to the MS अनिमित्तो, than to तिङ्निमित्तो. Besides Bhar. has once read अतन्निमित्त later on. Further, *tip* unnecessarily limits the scope of a non-*kṅit* suffix. — यथा शे रियतीति (*l.* 10) is our emendation of the MS पय्याज्ञेरवीतीति (obviously corrupt). AL reconstruct the expression as उपधारोरवीति and Sw as (ब्रू)यभो रोरवीति. Both have missed the truth. The passage is evidently meant to supply some instance for शचङन्ते दोषः. रोरवीति will not do here for the simple reason that in its case गुणः प्राप्नोति is no problem, in fact it wants it. We think that पय्या is corrupt for यथा and ज्ञे for शे. The following रियति (corrupted into रवीति) is quoted directly from the *Mbh.*

(*p.* 8, *l.* 10) ननु च क्रियमाणे ... etc. A defence by the तन्निमित्तवादिन्. His argument is that in *ri* + (*ś*)*a* + *ti* the Guṇa which is caused by *ti* is *asiddha*, being

external in comparison with the prohibition of Guṇa caused by *śa*. — Here ग्रहणेदोष of the MS is evidently to be understood as ग्रहणेऽदोष since the alleged drawback is being denied. (This अकारप्रश्लेष does away with the insertion of न by Sw.) Secondly, चाक्रियमाणे of the MS, though, retained by the eds., is to be corrected to च क्रि°. Since the objection against the तन्निमित्तग्रहणवाद् is here being denied, the speaker will naturally say क्रियमाणे तन्निमित्तग्रहणे.

अत्रेदमेवमुपात्तिनिमित्तं वर्ण्यते (*l.* 12). The MS reads here म(or भ)त्रेदामवमुपात्तनितिम व°, which is emended into अत्रेदमेवमुपात्तनिमित्तं व° by AL and into °त्तमिति न व° by Sw. Though we are not quite satisfied, We tentatively follow AL's emendation; only, for grammar's sake, we would like to read उपात्त°. (वक्ष्यति चैतत् refers to *Vār*. 3 and also *Mbh*. I. 55. 4 ff.: अथ वा बहिरङ्गो गुणो ... etc.) परिहारान्तरम्, an alternative solution (as far as the *Mbh*. is concerned).

[2. 3]

(*p*. 8, *l*. 14) हतः, हथः. Here Pat. adds some examples of his own, where it could be said that the तन्निमित्तग्रहण serves to avoid the undesired prohibition of Guṇa and Vṛddhi. The *Mbh*. reads : इमानि च भूयस्तन्निमित्तग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनानि — हतो हथः, उपोयते औयत, लौयमानिः पौयमानिः, नेनिक्त इति. In all these cases phonemes termed Guṇa and Vṛddhi are followed by *kṅit* suffixes. (In हतः, हथः and नेनिक्ते, the endings are *ṅit* by P. I. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुकमपित् ; in उपोयते and औयत there is the passive suffix *yak* ; the same in लौयमानिः and पौयमानिः). Here preservation of Guṇa and Vṛddhi is desired. This can be achieved on the ground that the Guṇa and Vṛddhi are not caused by the *kṅit* suffix ; they are caused by something else.

In पूर्वपक्षोऽत्रा ... ङिक्त्सु निवर्तत इति (*ll*. 14–17) the *Dīp*. clarifies the position of the 'Guṇa' in *hataḥ* and *hathaḥ* for the benefit of the layman. In the context of prohibition of Guṇa, one ordinarily expects that the Guṇa substitute (usually for an original *ik*), taught by some rule is prohibited in a particular case ; it does not materialize there. How does then *hataḥ* come in here ? In what sense could this be an example of Guṇa substitution ? The question, though *prima facie* reasonable, is not justified. In the Pāṇinian system, Guṇa, in the first instance, is not the name of a process (of substitution). Guṇa is the name of three phonemes : a (including *ar al*), *e* and *o* (P. 1. 1. 2). So there is *already* a Guṇa in *hataḥ*.

Now we go into the further technical aspect of the problem. The prohibition (whether obligatory or optional) can be done in two ways : (1) By causing to retire the undesired element which has already found its place because of too wide a general rule etc. (2) By prohibiting the element before it has raised its head. The former alternative (पूर्वपक्षः) is of the nature of *nivṛtti* 'retirement', the latter of *anutpatti* 'non-materialization'.

Bhar. now says that when Pat. gives the example of *hataḥ* the *pūrva-pakṣa* (first alternative), i. e. retirement, is intended. What he means is that the rule क्ङिति च demands retirement of the radical *a* which is the Guṇa here. (This can be avoided successfully by the तन्निमित्तग्रहण, since the Guṇa *a* in *han* is not caused by the *ṅit* suffix *-tas*; it is built-in.

In यथैव 'अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः'... etc. Bhar. briefly gives the *modus operandi* and two parallels. If the original general rule teaching some element and the particular one teaching its absence somewhere are taken as two independent statements, without being combined into a single *vākya* (*vākyabhedena*), then the element which has already taken its place is made to retire (*nivṛtti*). This is so, e. g. in the case of *śap* which is taught for all roots in a particular environment (P. 3. 1. 68 : कर्तरि शप्) but is to be deleted after the roots of the *ad*-class (P. 2. 4. 71 : अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः). On the other hand, if the two rules are combined into a single *vākya* (*ekavākyatā*), the exceptional particular rule modifies the general rule even while the latter is operating, and the element is prevented from appearing by nipping it in the bud. The rule P. 3. 1. 31 : आयादय आर्धधातुके वा can be quoted as an example. If, e. g., P. 3. 1. 28 : गूपूधूप ··· etc. and 31 : आयादयः ... etc. are taken as together making a single statement, then *āya* etc. do not appear (of course optionally) when an Ārdhadhātuka follows. (The *Mbh.* under P. 3. 1. 31 illustrates how this एकवाक्यता can be effected. Since one has the freedom of interpretation Bhar. in our present case quotes it as an example of वाक्यभेद, in keeping with the matter in hand.)

Read Kaiy. on this *Mbh.* : एतद्वाक्य(i. e. पा. ३. १. ३१ : 'आयादयः ...')निरपेक्षैरायादिविधानवाक्यैः (i. e. पा. ३. १. २८ : 'गूपूधूप ...' इत्यादिभिः) परनिमित्तानपेक्षा आयादयो यदा विधीयन्ते, तदानेन ('आयादयः-' इत्यनेन) आर्धधातुके तेषां निवृत्तिः क्रियते। यद्यपि नित्याः शब्दास्तथापि शास्त्रप्रक्रियायां क्वचिदुत्पन्नस्य लोपादिद्वारेण निवृत्तिः क्रियते, क्वचिदपवादविधानेनोत्सर्गस्यानुत्पत्तिर्ज्ञाप्यते।

When Pat. speaks of the utility of तन्निमित्तग्रहण in the preservation of Guṇa against the attack of P. 1. 1. 5, he is relying on the *nivṛtti* alternative (पूर्वपक्षोऽत्राभिमतः as Bhar. says), since the Guṇa *a* is a *fait accompli* by reason of its being embedded in the root in the Dhātupāṭha itself (P. Dh. II. 2).

(*p.* 8, *l.* 17) प्रसक्तस्यानभिनिर्वृत्तस्येति. This is a *pratīka* of the following *Mbh.* which refutes the above mentioned utility of तन्निमित्तग्रहण in हतः etc. नैतानि सन्ति प्रयोजनानि। इह तावत् — हतो हथ इति। प्रसक्तस्यानभिनिर्वृत्तस्य प्रतिषेधेन निवृत्तिः शक्या कर्तुम्। अयं च धातूपदेशावस्थायामेवाकारः.

The *Dīp.* raises a question (किमर्थं द्वयमुच्यते) about reading both प्रसक्तस्य 'become due' and अनभिनिर्वृत्तस्य 'not materialized' simultaneously. Will not any one of the two do? एवमर्थम् वक्तव्यम् etc. gives the reply. In order to be

subject to the prohibition *kṅiti ca*, an operation has to be *both* ‘become due’ (by a universal rule) but such as has not already materialized. The *Dīp.* तस्माद्ययवधार्मामया (which accounts for reading the word प्रसक्त) is corrupt. Looked at mere orthographically, one is tempted to reconstruct it as तस्माद् व्यवधानधियात्र but has to be rejected straightway, as it serves no purpose. Another reconstruction which suggests itself is तस्माद्वचनधर्मा (or °र्मो) मया (even °धर्मधिया) but this too fares no better. Usually Kaiy. furnishes a clue. In the present case he comments : प्रसक्तस्येति। सामान्यलक्षणेन विशेषलक्षणापरामर्शेन यत् प्राप्तं पुनर्विशेषलक्षणपरामर्शनात् स्वरूपेणानभिनिर्वृत्तं तस्य निवृत्तिः क्रियते. We do not know how this meaning could be expressed by the small phrase contained in the corrupt *Dīp.* We admit our defeat in reconstructing the *Dīp.* here. (Sw keeps the text as it is — with a querry mark, while AL emend it into तस्माद्यदवधि अप्राप्तं तत्र ..., with what benefit we do not know.)

The next sentence तद्य(? °था)नभिनिर्वृत्तस्य ... etc. justifies the inclusion of अनभिनिर्वृत्त. (Here we suggest तथान for तद्यन. The MS repeats तद्यन after आत्म which is rightly dropped by Sw.) ‘You can prevent something only before it is a *fait accompli*.’

(*p.* 8, *l.* 22) इह कश्चिद् गुणः सन्नेव ... etc. Bhar. says that the presence of the Guṇa (the phonemes *a*, *e*, *o*) is taught in grammar in two ways : (1) To make the Guṇa embedded in the basic constituents, as a sort of *fait accompli* (as in roots *han* etc.), or (2) to teach it as a substitute for what is taught (पाठ) usually in the form of *ik* (विधेयः; I supply इग् in accordance with P. 1. 1. 3). The example given is of *kṛ*>*kar* before the suffix *tṛc*. (Here again Sw retains the corrupt text of the MS. We accept AL's विधेयः (for the MS विधयः, read as विषयः by Sw). We emend श्रुता(AL °त्या)दिषु into कर्तादिषु as required by the context of विधान of Guṇa. Our other emendations are : पाठं for माठ, तृचि for त्रिचि, and तृजादिषु for वृजादिषु. We do not know where AL bring in नोनाव बेभिदिता from ! similarly their मरीमृजादिषु.)

तत्रायं प्रतिषेधो ... (*l.* 24). The *Dīp.* says that the absence of Guṇa is also taught in two ways : (1) By preventing the Guṇa (with rules like क्ङिति च etc.) where it has yet to materialize (though theoretically due) — स च पुनर्निवर्त्यते as the *Dīp.* says. (2) By teaching an outright elision, or some such practice where it has already found a place, e. g. the deletion of *śap* after roots of *ad*-class. In Kaiy.'s terminology, the previous is the case of *anutpatti*, whereas the second is that of *nivṛtti*. — अयं प्रतिषेधः means the one taught by P. 1. 1. 5 : क्ङिति च. — विधीयमानस्य भावादेव ... etc. It is natural that P. 1. 1. 5 causes to retire that Guṇa which is in the making (as in *bhinna* by पुगन्तलघूपधस्य), and not that which is a *fait accompli* (भूतम्) (as in हतः etc.). One can say that P. 1. 1. 5 has only a ‘preventive’ power, not of curing. — इह तु ... etc. : In the

case of P. 2. 4. 72 : अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः and P. 3. 1. 31 : आयादय आर्धधातुके वा (the parallels adduced by the opponent) the undesired element is *bhūta*, nor *vidhīyamāna*. अन्यः = विधीयमानः, अनुत्पन्नः. (MS सातोन्य(? °त्य, °न्य)वर्त्यः is corrupt. AL simply read अतो निवर्त्यः. We emend it tentatively to सन्तोऽपि निवर्त्याः). So the parallel will not do. The moral of the whole story is that since there is no danger of P. 1. 1. 5 applying to *hataḥ* etc., there is no need to read *tannimitta* in order to prevent it.

(*p*. 8, *l*. 27) उपोयत इति। Here उभयपद्=उप+ऊयते। After बहिरङ्गः a statement असिद्धं बहिरङ्गमन्तरङ्गे is understood. So again, no need of तन्निमित्तग्रहण. — Here the MS reads : एवमपि प्रसक्तोनभिनिर्वृत्तः शक्यते प्रतिषेद्धुं निर्वृत्तर(? °त्त इ)ति. We do not know what to make of it. It perhaps means to say that the Guṇa here is at least *anabhinirvṛtta* (as against *hataḥ* where it is *nirvṛtta*), and so could be prohibitted by P. 1. 1. 5. But being *asiddha* it does not require the help of *tannimitta*. But then the following निर्वृत्त इति remains hanging. — औयत इति। आटो वृद्धि ... etc. (*l*. 28). औयत=आ(ट्)+ऊय (saṁprasāraṇa of $\sqrt{ve}$+*ya*[*k*] +त. Vṛddhi by P. 6. 1. 90 : आटश्च. Here *āṭ*, the cause of Vṛddhi, is itself caused (as a substitute of *aṭ*) by *ta* (which represents *laṅ*). — लौयमानिरिति (*p*. 9, *l*. 1). Here the Vṛddhi is caused by the patronymic suffix (*iñ*) furnished with *ñ* (cf. P. 7. 2. 117).

(*p*. 9, *l*. 1) अनेनिज इति, 'परेण रूपेण ... etc.' is how the *Mbh*. refutes the utility of तन्निमित्तग्रहण in the matter of preserving the Guṇa. The point is that there is no immediacy between the reduplication viz. *ne*– and the finite ending, the two being intervened by *-nij-*, the *para-rūpa* (the latter, i.e. the radical part of the whole reduplicated word). So P. 1. 1. 5 will have no effect on it.

पूर्वपक्षः कथम् etc. (*l*. 2). पूर्वपक्षः=the interpretation of P. 1. 1. 5 in the present contex according to the तन्निमित्तग्रहणवादिन्. Since the *Mbh*. never spelt out this view, a question is thus asked. The *Dīp*. says that the *pūrvapakṣa* here is the same as in the case of पुगन्तलघूपध stems; that is *aṅga* is to be understood as *kāryin*, i. e. as undergoing the Guṇa. Since there is immediacy between the *aṅga* (i.e. *nenij*–) and the following *kṅit* suffix, the prohibitin of Guṇa becomes due. (So the तन्निमित्तग्रहण is necessary to prevent it.) Kaiy. says similarly (and a bit more expressly) : क्ङित्परत्वेनाङ्गस्य विशेषणत्वादङ्गस्यात्र कार्यित्वात् [इति] पूर्वः पक्षः. — उत्तरपक्षः — अभ्यासस्य ... etc. According to the final view it is the *abhyāsa* (not *aṅga*) that undergoes the operation.

Observation : Although the MS clearly writes अनेनिजः beyond the shade of a doubt, that cannot certainly be the original reading. Firstly, the *Mbh*. here reads नेनिक्ते and there is no reason why it should require a change. Secondly, अनेनिजः is entirely out of place here for the simple reason that there is no *kṅit* suffix here which would give, even *prima facie*, occasion for P. 1. 1. 5 to apply,

which would have resulted into an undesired loss of Guṇa. The ending *s* in अनेनिजः is technically *sip*, and being *pit* it cannot be *ṅit* (P. 1. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुक-मपित्). It therefore ill suits the purpose of the तन्निमित्तग्रहणवादिन्.

Perhaps it may be suggested that अनेनिजः is not a simple Imperf. but an Intensive (यङ्लुगन्त) form. But even then Pāṇ. definitely teaches Guṇa for the reduplication syllable in Intensives with and without *yaṅ* (P. 7. 4. 82 : गुणो यङ्लुकोः) and it would be absurd for the तन्निमित्तग्रहणवादिन् to claim a prohibition of Guṇa on the basis of *ṅ* in *yaṅ*. Lastly अनेनिजः could be a corrupt form for अनेनिजुः (Aor.) (where the ending (*j*)*us* is *ṅit*). But even this does not stand scrutiny because there is no possibility of Guṇa for the radical *i* and consequently no possibility of Guṇa being undesiredly prohibited by P. 1. 1. 5.

It just seems that नेनिक्ते came to be replaced by अनेनिजः at the hands of some 'learned' scribe. It is unthinkable that Bhar. introduced this change. (Sw maintains अनेनिजः with a query while AL silently reinstate नेनिक्ते.)

[2. 4]

धातुं क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेषयिष्यामः. After refuting *hataḥ* etc. as requiring the तन्निमित्तग्रहण (examples mentioned in the *Mbh.* itself), Pat. now begins refutation of the *Vār.* उपधारोरवीत्यर्थम्. He thus begins : उपधार्थेन तावन्नार्थः। धातोरिति वर्तते। धातुं क्ङित्परत्वेन विशेषयिष्यामः। The idea of this *Mbh.* is to segregate धातु from धातुलोपे (P. 1. 1. 4), to treat it as Geni. sing (धातोः) and to qualify it by क्ङिति. The resultant statement of P. 1. 1. 5 is thus given by the *Dīp.* क्ङिति धातोरनन्तरस्य गुणो न भवति. Since the root *bhid-* precedes immediately the suffix (*k*)*ta*, P. 1. 1. 5 will now effectively prohibit Guṇa in *bhinna*.

स्वरितकरणात् प्रकरणप्राप्तो धातुः (*l.* 5). This is to justify continuation of *dhātu* in P. 1. 1. 5. The word *dhātu-* (in *dhātulope*) is to be understood as having a *svarita* accent. So by P. 1. 3. 11 : स्वरितेनाधिकारः, it comes down and becomes a part of P. 1. 1. 5. The *Dīp.* अर्थोऽनुमीयते etc. seems to explain, in two ways, how from *dhātu-* you get the meaning of *dhātoḥ*. Either you first supply (lit. infer) the necessary meaning which provides you with the word, or, alternatively, you first think of the necessary word, which presents you the meaning. We are not quite sure what exactly Bhar. means. (Both eds. read संनिहितार्थो following the MS. We understand an अकारप्रश्लेष before this : ऽसंनि°. Moreover we understand the expression as meaning असंनिहितस्य [पदस्य] अर्थः. The MS योप्य-शब्दं is read as येनापशब्दं by AL. We read it as योथ शब्दं. Both the eds. retain ऽनुमीयते after येनार्थो. We think the *anumāna* works only in the first stage. अर्थ is not inferred (अनुमीयते) from शब्द; it is *known* by word-power after you have cognized the word. So we suggest the emendation ऽवसीयते.)

(*p.* 9, *l.* 10) यदि धातुर्विशेष्यते ... etc. The full text of the *Mbh.* is as follows : यदि धातुर्विशेष्यते, विकरणस्य न प्राप्नोति — चिनुतः, सुनुतः; लुनीतः, पुनीतः ...[17]

इति. If *kṅiti* is construed with *dhātoḥ*, then the rule will mean (in the words of Kaiy.) : क्ङित्यनन्तरस्य धातोर्गुणवृद्धी न भवतः. The prohibition, now restricted to roots, will not apply to Vikaraṇas. One cannot then explain the absence of Guṇa for Vikaraṇa in forms like *cinutaḥ*.— अयमभिप्रायः (*l.* 10) etc. A clarification by the *dhātuviśeṣyavādin*. If *dhātoḥ* is brought down in P. 1. 1. 5, please don't suppose that it is meant to exclude the Vikaraṇa from the operation of the prohibition (P. 1. 1. 5). Far from that, it is done with an intention of making *kṅiti* qualify *dhātu* (so as to justify absence of Guṇa in *bhinna* etc.) But how can a word which is not principal be qualified by another word ? Well, if the qualifying of *dhātu* by *kṅiti* were to be ruled out on the ground that *dhātu* is not a principal word (but subordinate to *lopa*), then the *anuvṛtti* would be superfluous. To avoid this superfluousness (सामर्थ्यात् = अन्यथा वैयर्थ्यात्), qualifying even a subordinate word is to be accepted. — It's all right, the objector may continue. But if in this process the Vikaraṇas undesiredly go scotfree and escape the prohibition, what are you going to do about it ? The धातुविशेष्यवादिन् will probably say : Wait a bit. Don't be so impatient. The *Mbh.* which follows (विहितविशेषणं धातुग्रहणम्) will solve your doubt. (The MS पुवमर्थं is emended into एवमर्थं in both older eds. In the light of above interpretation our emendation नैवमर्थं will be found better.)

(*p.* 9, *l.* 12) विहितविशेषणं धातुग्रहणम्. विहितविशेषणम् = ' विहित 'पदस्य विशेषणम्. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs as follows : नैष दोषः। विहितविशेषणं धातुग्रहणम् — धातोर्यो विहित इति। The वाक्यशेष referred to in the *Dīp.* is यः विहितः or संबन्धी. A Sūtra, by its very nature, requires details to be furnished (सोपस्कारत्वात्). So the addition of *vihita*. Now, whether (1) धातोर्यो विहितस्तस्य क्ङित्यनन्तरे (गुणो न) or (2) धातोर्विहिते क्ङित्यनन्तरस्य (गुणो न) is the intended construction seems to have been deliberately kept vague in the *Mbh.* Bhar. tells us in advance that the 2nd is the really intended one. His धातोर्यः संबन्धी तस्मिन् भवति is to be expanded as धातोर्यः संबन्धी क्ङित् प्रत्ययः तस्मिन् परतः अनन्तरस्य धातोर्विकरणस्य वा गुणो न भवति. As expected, the opponent (इतरः) falls for the 1st interpretation. धातोर्विहितस्य in the *Dīp.* = विकरणस्य. Hence the immediate objection in the following *Mbh.* : धातोरेव तर्हि न प्राप्नोति. (MS सामर्थ्याह; AL सामर्थ्यादाह; Sw सामर्थ्याद(?). We emend the MS text into समर्थ्याह. Firstly, सामर्थ्य has no place here. Secondly, समर्थ्य fits well with समर्थयते occurring in the *Dīp.* in *l.* 16).

(*p.* 9, *l.* 15) धातोरेव तर्हि न प्राप्नोति. See the note above. Cf. Kaiy. धातोर्विहितस्य क्ङित्यनन्तरे नेति मत्वा प्रश्नः.

नैवं विज्ञायते. This *Mbh.* is introduced in the *Dīp.* with the remark इतरः क्ङितीत्येतस्य ... etc. It means to say that the filling in of धातोः (विहिते) क्ङिति is equally valid as धातोः (विहितस्य) क्ङिति. The *Mbh.* concerned is : नैवं विज्ञायते

— धातोर्विहितस्य क्ङितीति । कथं तर्हि ? धातोर्विहिते क्ङितीति. This is explained by Kaiy. thus : धातोर्विहिते क्ङित्यनन्तरो यो — धातुर्वा विकरणो वा — तस्य प्रतिषेध इत्यर्थः.

(*p*. 9, *l*. 17) अथ वा कार्यकालं ... etc. An alternative solution. It is based on the claim that P. 1. 1. 5 is a Paribhāṣā. As such it will be present in every rule which teaches Guṇa, on the कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् view. When it is thus combined (एकवाक्यभावापन्नस्य) with P. 7. 3. 86 : पुगन्तलघूपधस्य it will mean पुगन्तलघूपधस्य क्ङिति गुणो न. Here one cannot argue that P. 1. 1. 5 cannot apply to the Guṇa-substitution for a light penultimate *ik* vowel on the ground that there is no immediacy. For, the very fact that the rule is framed to prohibit Guṇa substitute for a penultimate implies that mediacy is bound to be there and is therefore no bar to the application of P. 1. 1. 5. This fact is recognized in the Pari. : येन नाव्यवधानं तेन व्यवहितेऽपि वचनप्रामाण्यात्. So there will be no difficulty about prohibiting the Guṇa in cases like *bhinna* even in the absence of तन्निमित्तग्रहण.

कथमियं परिभाषा ? The idea is that every Pari. must have what is called a *liṅga* in order to indicate the rules in connection with which it is to operate. What is the *liṅga* of P. 1. 1. 5 which latter is being claimed to be a Paribhāṣā ? The reply is that the expressions *guṇa* and *vṛddhi* form the sign (*liṅga*). To explain : Along with the expression *guṇavṛddhī* from P. 1. 1. 3, the word *vṛddhiḥ* from P. 1. 1. 1 and *guṇaḥ* from 2 also follow into 1. 1. 5. So the meaning of P. 1. 1. 5, as the *Dīp*. says, is : यत्र गुणवृद्धी 'गुणवृद्धी' इति (i. e. गुणवृद्धिशब्दावुच्चार्य) विधीयेते तत्रानेन (= 'क्ङिति न' इत्यनेन) उपस्थातव्यम्. When the *Dīp*. says गुणवृद्धी इत्येतदनुवर्तते it is referring to the continuation of *vṛddhiḥ* and *guṇaḥ* from P. 1. 1. 1 and 2 respectively.

(*p*. 9, *l*. 22) अथ वा यदेतस्मिन् योगे. This represents the following *Mbh*. : अथ वा यदेतस्मिन् योगे क्ङिद्ग्रहणं क्रियते तदनवकाशम् । तस्यानवकाशत्वाद् गुणवृद्धी न भविष्यतः । Another alternative explanation, based either on the view that P. 1. 1. 3 is no Pari. at all, or, if one, on the यथोद्देशं संज्ञापरिभाषम् view. Further, it is to be understood, following Nāg., that the first explanation is based on the *vyakti* view (though neither Bhar. nor Kaiy. says so explicitly). The argument : A prohibition expects — on the *vyakti* view — as many cases or instances of prohibition as possible. Here this Sū. P. 1. 1. 5 repeats itself as many times as there are e. g. Guṇas to be prohibited (यावन्तः प्रतिषेध्यास्तावन्ति प्रतिषेधसूत्राणि). If immediacy is insisted on, then that rule which is supposed to deal with cases like *cita* will alone be fulfilled; the one dealing with *bhinna* will remain unfulfilled. (पुगन्तलघूपधे प्रतिषेध्येऽनवकाशः प्रतिषेधः). As this is not desired it will operate even where there is no immediacy. So the rule expects immediacy where it can be had, but not if it is not available (इदमपि क्ङितीति प्रतिषेधरूपं [सूत्रं, or शास्त्रं] प्रतिषेध्यापेक्षमेवानन्तर्यं प्रतिपद्यते ।). Consequently, it operates even where there is no immediacy (इति व्यवहितेऽपि प्रवर्तते).

The *Dīp.* यद्यपि परिभाषा…न प्रवर्तते paraphrases the *Mbh.* गुणवृद्धी न भविष्यत:. It underlines the principle that prohibition is prevention, not reversal of what is a *fait accompli* (प्रवृत्ते अशक्ये प्रतिषेद्धुम्). (We supply प्रतिषेध्ये after प्रतिषेधे. This necessary word seems to have been dropped hapl. We read, with Sw, प्रवृत्ते which we prefer to प्रवृत्तौ. However, we maintain, with AL, the MS प्रतिषेधरूपं, understanding a सूत्रं or शास्त्रं after it. We do not think it necessary to emend it to प्रतिषेधसूत्रं as Sw actually does.)

(*p.* 10, *l.* 1) अन्ये वर्णयन्ति. Another explanation of the *Mbh.* अथ वा, यदेतस्मिन् योगे … etc. This is based on the यथोद्देशं संज्ञापरिभाषम् view, according to which it is the injunctive rules which go to the Saṁjñā- and Paribhāṣā- rules for being benefitted by them; the Saṁjñā-s and Paribhāṣās stick to their place in the *Aṣṭ.* (यथोद्देशम्). Each time an injuctive rule is brought near a Paribhāṣā, the latter rule is repeated for being united with it. (प्रधानानि [=विधिसूत्राणि] भिन्नानि गुण[संज्ञापरिभाष]देशमुपसंपद्यमानानि गुणभेदं प्रयुञ्जते as the *Dīp.* says.) If the rule क्ङिति च when thus repeated cannot apply to पुगन्तलघूपध°, it will become redundant.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 4) अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिः … etc. The full text of the *Mbh.* here is : अथ वाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति—भवत्युपधालक्षणस्य गुणस्य प्रतिषेध इति, यदयं 'त्रसिगृधिधृषिक्षिपेः क्नुः' 'इको झल् हलन्ताच्च' इति क्नुसनौ कितौ करोति। कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम्? कित्करण एतत्प्रयोजनम् — गुणः कथं न स्यादिति। यदि चात्र गुणप्रतिषेधो न स्यात् कित्करणमनर्थकं स्यात्। पश्यति त्वाचार्यो — भवत्युपधालक्षणस्यापि गुणस्य प्रतिषेध इति, ततः क्नुसनौ कितौ करोति। The point is that if the code-letter *k* of the suffix (*k*)*nu* (P. 3. 2. 140 : त्रसिगृधि°) could not prevent the Guṇa substitution in the formation of *gṛdhnu* 'greedy' etc., its prefixion would be meaningless. This is an indication that even without तन्निमित्तग्रहण, P. 1. 1. 5 will apply to the Guṇa of the penultimate.

इदं लिङ्गम् (*l.* 4)…etc. It could be asked : It's all right that the *kitkaraṇa* gives a clue to Pāṇini's intention. But what happens to the अनन्तरपरिभाषा? How is the technical difficulty to be removed? This *Dīp.* points out the technical solution. It says that this clue (viz. *kitkaraṇa* of *knu* etc.) indicates that P. 1. 1. 66 : तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे either does not present itself here, or that if it does, merely requires a preceding element in general (*pūrvamātre*) to undergo the operation concerned, without insisting on its immediate precedence (*avyavahita-pūrva*). — इदं लिङ्गम् = क्नुप्रत्ययस्य कित्करणम्. अङ्गविकला = अव्यवहितपूर्वरूपेण अङ्गेन विकला. (Kaiy. does not mention the first alternative viz. नोपतिष्ठते. He mentions only the second one.)

(*p.* 10, *l.* 6) अथ वा, गुणभूतयोः … etc. Here Bhar. adds two more solutions (not mentioned in the *Mbh.* nor later by Kaiy.). One is to take *kṅiti* as qualifying *guṇa-vṛddhī*, although they are subordinate to the prohibition against the view of the *tannimittagrahaṇavādin*. Cf. the very introductory part of the

Dīp. under the present rule : गुणवृद्धी प्रतिषेधश्च द्वावपीहानुमीयमानौ। प्रतिषेधस्तु विधीयमानत्वात् प्रधानम्। न चास्मात् शब्दरूपादस्ति व्यक्तिः, प्रधानमनर्थ्येन विशेषणेन क्ङितीति। अस्ति चेदर्थित्वम्, प्रधानमतिलङ्घ्य न युक्तं गुणवृद्धिविशेषणम्। So now the Sū. means क्ङिति ये गुणवृद्धी (विहिते), ते न भवतः. No need of तन्निमित्तग्रहण.

The other solution is given in the *Dīp.* यस्य वा गुण उच्यते ... etc. which is not clear.

[3]

(*p.* 10, *l.* 8) न लुमता तस्मिन्निति. Having finished the examination of the उपधार्थ purpose of the तन्निमित्तग्रहण, the *Mbh.* is now examining the रोरवीत्यर्थ part. The *Mbh.* first denies the utility of the तन्निमित्तग्रहण on the ground that no *kṅit* suffix is *seen* in *roravīti* and consequently there being no threat to the Guṇa, तन्निमित्तग्रहण is not necessary. When it is pointed out that the suffix *yaṅ* deleted by P. 2. 4. 74 : यङोऽचि च can become active again by virtue of P. 1. 1. 62 : प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणम्, the *Mbh.* says that a प्रत्ययलक्षण operation can be prevented by reading P. 1. 1. 63 as न लुमता तस्मिन् (instead of न लुमताङ्गस्य). न लुमता तस्मिन् is a variant proposed by Pat. under P. 1. 1. 63 itself (cf. यदि पुनर् 'न लुमता तस्मिन्' इत्युच्येत *Mbh.* I. 169. 1. The *Dīp.* refers to this *Mbh.* when it says: पाठान्तरं गृहीत्वोच्यते). The rule in this revised form means (in the words of Kaiy.) : लुमता [=लुक्, श्लुः इत्यादिना] यो लुप्तः प्रत्ययस्तस्मिन् यत् कार्यम् [तन्निमित्तकम्] — आङ्गमनाङ्गं वा — तन्न भवति. Although P. 1. 1. 63 : न लुमताङ्गस्य prohibits a प्रत्ययलक्षण operation even after the deletion of a suffix, this concession is limited to an *āṅga* operation, i. e. an operation which concerns an *aṅga* (stem) and is taught in the jurisdiction of P. 6. 4. 1 : अङ्गस्य. So it is of no use to us since our present prohibition (P. 1. 1. 5) is outside the jurisdiction of P. 6. 4. 1. So now here the *Mbh.* takes advantage of the emendation proposed there (under 1. 1. 63), and says that the prohibition, though not an *āṅga* operation, is available by the emended rule न लुमता तस्मिन्. No need of तन्निमित्तग्रहण.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 8) अथापि यथान्यासम्, एवमपि ... This *Dīp.* is a commentary on the *Mbh.* : अथापि 'न लुमताङ्गस्य' इत्युच्यते, एवमपि न दोषः। कथम्? न लुमता लुप्तेऽङ्गाधिकारः प्रतिनिर्दिश्यते। किं तर्हि? योऽसौ लुमता लुप्यते तस्मिन् यदङ्गं तस्य यत् कार्यं तन्न भवति. Here it is claimed that there is no harm even if the established text (यथान्यासम्) is retained. We can understand that *aṅgasya* does not mean *aṅgādhikāra.* Whatever word element can be termed *aṅga* because of the suffix which is now deleted (लुमता च यस्याङ्गत्वं लक्षितम्), is barred from undergoing operation caused by that deleted suffix. (Bhar. points out that in this interpretation the Instrumental in *lumatā* is to be regarded *itthaṁbhūtalakṣaṇe* as taught by P. 2. 3. 21. (The MS च द्यागत्वं is emended to च यदङ्गं by AL. It is read as चाद्यांगत्वं with a question mark by Sw. Since the final त्वं is quite clear in the MS, we read the MS as [य]स्यांगत्वं.)

अथाङ्गस्येति च स्मर्यते (*l.* 10)...etc. This *Dīp.* refers to the *Mbh.* : अथाप्यङ्गाधिकारः प्रतिनिर्दिश्यते, एवमपि न दोषः। कथम् ? कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम्, यत्र कार्यं तत्र द्रष्टव्यम्। सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोर्गुणो भवतीति, उपस्थितमिदं भवति —'क्ङिति न' इति।

A *svarita* is the sign of *adhikāra* (P. 1. 3. 11). So Bhar. paraphrases अथाप्यङ्गाधिकारः by अथाङ्गस्येति च स्वर्यते. (The MS reads न स्वर्यते, which is retained by Sw also. AL emend it to च स्व° which is the correct text and so is accepted here.) Pat. says that it does not matter even if by अङ्गस्य (in P. 1. 1. 63) the technical अङ्गाधिकार (beginning with P. 6. 4. 1) is understood. For, in that case we can fall back upon the कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् view, understand that the prohibition P. 1. 1. 5, looked upon as a Pari., can present itself in those rules where Guṇa is taught (e. g. P. 7. 3. 84 : सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः). There the two combine into a single statement and so P. 1. 1. 5 can be said to be under the jurisdiction of P. 6. 4. 1 : अङ्गस्य. Hence the *Dīp.* : तद्देशमेवेदम्. Here तद् means 'सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः' etc. and इदम् means 'क्ङिति च'. (The MS उद्देशम् is read as उद्देश्यम् by AL, and as (यथो)द्देशम् by Sw. We read it as तद्देशम् which is more suitable.) When क्ङिति च is present in सार्वधातुका° (P. 7. 3. 84) it is under the अङ्गाधिकार (P. 6. 4. 1).

The *Dīp.* इह तु लाघवार्थो ... etc. is meant to reply a possible question : Then why did Pāṇini read this rule क्ङिति च in I. 1. He should have read it after P. 6. 4. 1. Why here ? 'For brevity's sake' is the reply. The *anuvṛtti* of न and गुणवृद्धी helps to make our rule a short one.

Kaiy. is silent on this part of the *Mbh.* Nāg., however, brings out the idea fully thus : अङ्गाधिकार इति। स्वरितलिङ्गासङ्गेनेति भावः। कार्यकालमिति। तथा च तत्रोपस्थितत्वादिदमप्याङ्गम्, अङ्गाधिकारस्थैकवाक्यतापन्नत्वादिति भावः। स्वरितत्वासङ्गवशात् तदधिकारपठितमिव तदधिकारस्थैकवाक्यतापन्नमपि गृह्यते इति तात्पर्यम्। On the prohibition rule being looked upon as a Pari. he observes : निषेधेऽपि परिभाषासादृश्यात् परिभाषात्वमुक्तम्। सादृश्यं च निषेध्याकाङ्क्षया तदेकवाक्यतामात्रेणेति बोध्यम्।

(*p.* 10, *l.* 12) अथ वा बहिरङ्गो गुणः ... etc. With the *Dīp.* तत्रासतः प्रतिषेध्यस्य कथं प्रतिषेधेन निवृत्तिः स्यात्, cf. Kaiy. ततश्चासिद्धत्वाद् असत्त्वान् निषेधानुपपत्तिः.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 14) अथ वा पूर्वस्मिन् योगे ... etc. The last alternative reason why तन्निमित्तग्रहण is not necessary for रोरवीति. The *Mbh.* runs as : अथ वा पूर्वस्मिन् योगे यदार्धधातुकग्रहणम् तदनवकाशं स्यात्। तस्यानवकाशत्वात् गुणो भविष्यति।

The *Mbh.* means to say that if P. 1. 1. 5 : क्ङिति च were to apply to रोरवीति, then the word आर्धधातुके in P. 1. 1. 4 (पूर्वस्मिन् योगे) will be without scope; it will be useless. This indicates that P. 1. 1. 5 does not apply to रोरवीति (and so तन्निमित्तग्रहण is not necessary to prevent it). As the argument is not clear at first sight (or hearing), it requires some explanation. (Unfortunately neither Bhar. nor Kaiy. explains the argument. They only offer some comments

on some aspects of it, presuming obviously that the original argument itself is too clear to require an explanation).

(1) To start with, it is presumed in the *Mbh.* that the word *ārdha-dhātuka* is read in P. 1. 1. 4 for the sake of such form as *roravīti* only. It has no other purpose. It is claimed that if *ārdhadhātuke* is not included, and the Sū. simply reads as न धातुलोपे (इको गुणवृद्धी), then, since there is a धातुलोप (i. e. धात्वंशलोप, viz. the deletion of *yaṅ*) in *roravīti*, there cannot be Guṇa for the radical syllable. To prevent this and to arrive at the desired Guṇa form *roravīti* *ārdhadhātuke* is added. Now since the following suffix here is *tip* which is not *ārdhadhātuka*, the prohibition P. 1. 1. 4 does not apply to *roravīti*. (According to another interpretation, the deletion of *yaṅ* is *anaimittika* ' without any cause ', and since it is not caused by an *ārdhadhātuka*, P. 1. 1. 4 does not apply here.)

Since such is the case, it is maintained that if P. 1. 1. 5 is allowed to apply to *roravīti*, it will render the word *ārdhadhātuke* in P. 1. 1. 4 useless; it would be against Pāṇini's intention. And so we deduce that Pāṇini did not intend that P. 1. 1. 5 should apply to *roravīti*. The radical Guṇa *does* take place (तस्यानवकाशत्वात् गुणो भवति).

(2) A doubt arises here. (It is here that Bhar. and Kaiy. take up the matter.) How do you know that *ārdhadhātuke* is meant only for forms like *roravīti* ? It may have some other purpose. It is possible that Pāṇini wanted to make it clear that *dhātulopa-* (in P. 1. 1. 4) is a *Bahuvrīhi* (धातोर्लोपो यस्मिन् , = धातुलोपनिमित्त), by adding *ārdhadhātuka-* as the अन्यपदार्थ (i. e. The substantive qualified by the compound *dhātulopa-*). So if the presence of *ārdhadhātuka* can thus be explained on another hypothesis, it does not follow of necessity that P. 1. 1. 4 does not apply to *roravīti*. This objection is put by Bhar. thus : ननु च उभयविशेषणार्थमार्धधातुकग्रहणं सावकाशमुच्यते. Here उभयविशेषणार्थम् ' to qualify both ' means to qualify both (1) the *lopa* and also (2) *guṇavṛddhī*. This twofold qualification by *ārdhadhātuke* is possible only if *dhātulopa* is understood as Bahuvrīhi (qualifying *ārdhadhātuke*) Cf. Kaiy. : ननु बहुव्रीह्यर्थमुभयविशेषणाय (' उभयविशेषणाय बहुव्रीह्यर्थमित्यन्वयः '; Nāg.) आर्धधातुकग्रहणं स्यादिति कथमनवकाशत्वम् ?

For this *ubhayaviśeṣaṇa* read the *Mbh.* under P. 1. 1. 4 : किं पुनरिदमार्धधातुकग्रहणं लोपविशेषणम्—आर्धधातुकनिमित्ते लोपे सति ये गुणवृद्धी प्राप्नुतस्ते न भवतः इति, आहोस्वित् गुणवृद्धिविशेषणमार्धधातुकग्रहणम् — धातुलोपे सत्यार्धधातुकनिमित्ते ये गुणवृद्धी प्राप्नुतस्ते न भवत इति।... यथेच्छसि तथास्तु । (I. 51. 3–8) On this Kaiy. observes : बहुव्रीहिपक्षे उभयविशेषणम्. It can be expressed thus : आर्धधातुकनिमित्तके धातुलोपे सति ये तदार्धधातुकनिमित्ते गुणवृद्धी प्राप्नुतस्ते न भवतः. (Though the MS clearly reads सार्वधातुकग्रहणं, it is palpably wrong and so we read, with older eds., आर्ध°.)

(3) This objection is refuted on the ground that a Bahuvrīhi does not necessarily stand in need of a specifically mentioned अन्यपदार्थ; it is possible even without it as in the case of the word *ekāc* in P. 6. 1. 1 : एकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य. Read *Kāś.* on this Sū. : 'एकाचः' इति बहुव्रीहिनिर्देशः। एकोऽच् यस्य सोऽयमेकाच् इत्यवयवेन विग्रहः। तत्र समुदायः समासार्थः। Here एकाच् is taken as a Bahuvrīhi in spite of the absence of the अन्यपदार्थ viz. समुदाय. Similarly धातुलोपः can be a Bahuvrīhi without needing आर्धधातुके for its अन्यपदार्थ. So the *jñāpaka* stands — Bhar. seems to offer this defence somewhat apologetically : सत्यम्। एवमेतत्। यदि त्वसत्यार्धधातुकग्रहणे बहुव्रीहिरस्ति, यथा 'एकाचो द्वे ...' इत्यत्र, तत एतदुपपन्नम्। Kaiy. is more dogmatic : ननु ... कथमनवकाशत्वम्? उच्यते, विनाप्यार्धधातुकग्रहणेन बहुव्रीहिर्लभ्यते, यथा 'एकाचो द्वे' इत्यत्र।

(*p.* 10, *l.* 17) रोरवीतीति लोपस्य ... etc. The *Dīp.* here tries to give some explanation of the purpose served by *ārdhadhātuke* in that rule. P. 1. 1. 4 does not apply to *roravīti* because the *lopa* there is not due to an *ārdhadhātuka.* (अतन्निमित्तत्वात् = अनार्धधातुकनिमित्तत्वात्.) But it serves an additional purpose also. It also makes all other prohibitions (of Guṇa), like our P. 1. 1. 5, null and void in the case of *roravīti,* since if Guṇa were prohibited by rule like 1. 1. 5, it would be useless to protect it from P. 1. 1. 4 alone. It has to be protected from all other Guṇa-prohibiting rules. So that *ārdhadhātuke* is a signal of यावती धातुलोपे प्रतिषेधप्राप्तिस्तावती सार्वधातुके न भवतीति. Cf. Kaiy. : ... सूत्रान्तरप्राप्तोऽपि निषेधो बाध्यत इत्यर्थः.

(*p.* 10, *l.* 18) त्रेऽपि सावकाशत्वम् ... etc. An objection against the *anavakāśatva* argument is stated and refuted here. The objection : How do you believe that *ārdhadhātuke* will be meaningless if *kṅiti ca* were to apply to *roravīti*? For, even if Guṇa were prohibited in *roravīti*, *ārdhadhātuke* can serve a useful purpose. It can still prevent the prohibition and can successfully preserve Guṇa in forms like *johorti*. Nor can it be maintained that such *yaṅluganta* forms as *johorti* are incorrect and that they do not therefore require any grammatical provision For *yaṅluganta* forms are allowed in the classical Sanskrit also. It is a mistake to suppose that they (like *roravīti*) are valid in the Veda alone. Since the reading of the word *ārdhadhātuke* can be explained on this other hypothesis also (viz. its utility in forms like *johortī*), that reading is no clue to suggest that P. 1. 1. 5 does not apply to *roravīti*. (And so to protect the Guṇa there, तन्निमित्तग्रहण is necessary.)

What the objector means is this : In *johorti* there is another *dhātulopa,* viz. of *ch*. This is caused by the following ending *ti*. Now, if *ārdhadhātuka* is dropped and P. 1. 1. 4 is read simply as न धातुलोपे, then that rule will apply to *johorti even if dhātulopa* is understood as a Bahuvrīhi (like *ekāc*), for here the ending *-ti* which follows is the cause of both the elision of *ch* and also of Guṇa.

Here the significance of the reading of *ārdhadhātuke* is seen. It prevents P. 1. 1. 4 from applying to *johorti* because the suffix concerned (*-ti*) is *sārvadhātuka*, not *ārdhadhātuka*. Nor should it be maintained that *yaṅluganta* is not available in the non-Vedic Sanskrit, for by reading *huśnuvoḥ* in his rule हुश्नुवोः सार्वधातुके (P. 6. 4. 87) Pāṇini has clearly indicated that *yaṅluganta* is available in the non-Vedic Sanskrit. (Read the *Kāś*. on P. 6. 4, 87 : इदमेव हुश्नुग्रहणं ज्ञापकम् – भाषायामपि यङ्लुगस्तीति । छन्दसि 'छन्दस्युभयथा' इत्यार्धधातुकत्वादेव यणादेशस्याप्रसङ्गः । न च यङ्लुगादन्यत् प्रत्युदाहरणमुवर्णान्तमनेकाजसंयोगपूर्वं सार्वधातुके विद्यते ।)

जोहोर्ति. This form is derived, according to the objector whose view is given above, from $\sqrt{}$*hurch* (P. Dh. I. 226) thus : *hurch* > *hur* (P. 6. 4. 21) > *juhur* (P. 6. 1. 9) > *johur* (P. 7. 4. 82) > *johor* (P. 7. 3. 86) + *yaṅ* (deleted, P. 2. 4. 74), + *śap* (deleted, P. 2. 4. 72) + *ti*(*p*).

This objection is refuted in the *Dīp*. त एवं पर्यनुयोज्या ... etc. The refutation consists in denying the form *johorti* as derived from *hurch*. No. It is a *yaṅluganta* from *hu-* 'offer'. Normally the *yaṅluganta* form would be *johoti* (optionally *johavīti*), but here the ending comes to have a prefix *r*(*uṭ*) and so the form is *johorti*. A parallel for such a *ruṭ* is furnished in the form of *aduhra* (in the expression *devā aduhra*), cf. P. 7. 1. 8 and 41. Since there is no *dhātulopa* at all in this form, there is no possibility of P. 1. 1. 4 applying to it. Consequently *ārdhadhātuka* cannot be shown to have any such scope viz. in the form of protecting the Guṇa against P. 1. 1. 4. So the only alternative remains viz. that *kṅiti ca*, and also every other similar rule prohibiting Guṇa (when a *sārvadhātuka* suffix follows) is barred from operating in connection with *roravīti*.

This sentence is considerably corrupt in the MS. (1) The MS थैपिमनवकाश° is read as अथाप्यनवकाश° by AL and as येऽपि अनवकाश by Sw. We read येऽपि सावकाश since this is evidently a refutation of the objection against the अनवकाशत्व argument. (2) Like old eds. we also read °काशत्वम् for the MS °काशम्. (3) We agree with Sw in supplying त (= ते) as the substantive to be qualified by पर्यनुयोज्याः. (4) AL unnecessarily emend पर्यनुयोज्या into योज्य. (5) हुर्छा° in the MS is all right. It need not be changed into हुर्छः as Sw does. (6) Here is the most crucial part : The MS जुहोतेरषे देवां दुद्रुवन् रुजगमइम इति is retained (with a question mark) by Sw. AL read it as जोहोर्तेरेतत् । एवं प्रादुद्रुवत् प्रासुस्रुवत् इति । (What on earth have these *caṅ* forms to do here ?) The reconstruction जुहोतेरेष 'देवा अदुहवत्' रुडागम इति came in a happy flash of intuition. For its appropriateness, see Notes above.

Observation : This is one of those few places where Kaiy. holds quite a different view from that of Bhar. While Bhar. refutes the सावकाशत्व of आर्धधातुके in forms like जोहोर्ति (by refusing to look upon it as from $\sqrt{}$*hurch*, and connect-

ing it with $\sqrt{hu}$), Kaiy. positively looks upon it as from $\sqrt{hurch}$, and even mentions a number of additional similar forms, तोतोर्ति, तोथोर्ति, मोमोर्ति etc. Subscribing to the view that *yaṅluk* is allowed in *bhāṣā* also, he says : एतच्च छान्दसत्वमभ्युपेत्य यङ्लुको (*Chāyā* : यङ्लुकश्छान्दसत्वमभ्युपेत्येत्यन्वयः) भाष्यकारेणोक्तम् । भाषाविषये तु यङ्लुको, बहूनि प्रयोजनानि आर्धधातुकग्रहणस्य संभवन्ति । तोतोर्ति तोथोर्ति ... इत्यादिषु तुर्वीथुर्वी ... असत्यार्धधातुकग्रहणे बहुव्रीहावप्याश्रिते 'न धातुलोप ...' इति गुणनिषेधः प्राप्नोति, स मा भूदित्येवमर्थमार्धधातुकग्रहणं स्यात् । अनेन ('क्ङिति च' इत्यनेन) चात्र व्यवधानान्नास्ति निषेध इति सति प्रयोजने कथमनवकाशं स्यात्?

[4]

(*p.* 10, *l.* 21) इह कस्मान्न भवति — लैगवायनः, कामयते ? This *Mbh.* raises a question as to why there should be no prohibition of Guṇa and Vṛddhi in लैगवायनः and कामयते. (The subject of *bhavati* is *pratiṣedhaḥ* understood.)

Laigavāyana is a patronymic from *ligu* with the suffix *phak* (= *āyana*, P. 7. 1. 2) by P. 4. 1. 99 : नडादिभ्यः फक्. Here the stem-final *u* undergoes Guṇa (P. 6. 4. 146 : ओर्गुणः), while *i* (in the first syllable) undergoes Vṛddhi (P. 7. 2. 118 : किति च). *Kāmayate* is from *kam*+*ṇiṅ* (P. 3. 1. 30) + *śap* + *tip*. Here *kam* > *kām* by P. 7. 2. 116 : अत उपधायाः. Now *phak* is a *kit*-suffix, and *ṇiṅ* a *ṅit* one. How is it, then, that P. 1. 1. 5 does not step in to prohibit Guṇa and Vṛddhi in the former example, and Vṛddhi in the latter? Here it is to be noted that this is a problem for both the तन्निमित्तग्रहणवादिन् and his opponent (cf. the *Chāyā* : उभयत्रोभयथापि क्ङित्प्रयुक्तो गुणादिनिषेधः स्यात्).

(*p.* 10, *l.* 22) The *Vār.* तद्धितकाम्योरिक्प्रकरणात् gives the explanation for this absence of prohibition. The prohibitive rule P. 1. 1. 5 occurs in the context of P. 1. 1. 3 : इको गुणवृद्धी. Naturally it can prohibit only that Guṇa or Vṛddhi which is taught for *ik* as such. In the present cases, the initial Vṛddhi in *laigavāyana* is taught for *acām ādi*, the final Guṇa for *u*, and the Vṛddhi in *kāmayate* for *at*. As none of these is taught specifically for *ik*, the prohibition does not apply. (The *Mbh.* इग्लक्षणयोर्गुणवृद्ध्योः प्रतिषेधः । न चैते इग्लक्षणे is paraphrased by the *Dīp.* as : 'इकः' इति वर्तते । 'गुणवृद्धी' च । तेन 'गुणवृद्धी' इत्येवं ये गुणवृद्धी इकस्ते न भवत इति । (Kaiy. simply : इक इत्येवं ये गुणवृद्धी तयोर्निषेध इत्यर्थः ।)

(*p.* 10, *l.* 22) तदपवादपक्षे ओर्गुणोऽपि ... etc. Bhar. here brings in a new point which is not mentioned by Kaiy. He suggests, by way of a *pūrvapakṣa*, that even granting that P. 1. 1. 5 prevents Guṇa and Vṛddhi only when they are *iglakṣaṇa* — i. e. taught for *ik* as such specifically — the objection still stands on the *tadapavāda* view. (According to this view, अङ्गस्य qualifies इकः, so that the injunction means : अङ्गस्य य इक् अन्त्योऽनन्त्यो वा तस्य गुणो भवति. And *u* here is an *ik*. So this is an *iglakṣaṇa* Guṇa. According to the *taccheṣa* view, however, the injunction means इगन्ताङ्गस्य गुणो भवति, which is not an *iglakṣaṇa*

Guṇa). — तदपवादपक्षः परित्यक्तः etc. is the reply. The *tadapavāda* view has been already abandoned and P. 1. 1. 3 merely generates another Genitive *ikaḥ*. (द्वितीया षष्ठी प्रादुर्भाव्यते । *Mbh*. I. 46. 28.) So there is no *iglakṣaṇa* Guṇa here.

[5]

लकारस्य ङित्वात् ... etc. (*Vār*. 5). This *Vār*. brings up the question of forms like *acinavam* (derived from *a*(*ṭ*) + *ci* + *nu* > *no* > *nav* + *am* (representing *laṅ*). Since the original *lakāra* (viz. *laṅ*) is *ṅit*, its substitute *am* (through *mip*) has to be regarded as *ṅit* by reason of *sthānivadbhāva*. So P. 1. 1. 5 can prohibit Guṇa. — The *Vār*. is worded somewhat clumsily. ङित्वात् स्थानिवद्भावः is not the intended construction. Also स्थानिवद्भावः is not the real predicate. स्थानिवद्भावेन लङादेशानाम् (अमादीनां) ङित्वात् गुणनिषेधप्रसङ्गः is the intended statement.

(*p*. 10, *l*. 25) स्थानिवद्भावात् कार्यम् ... etc. The *Dīp*. illustrates the application of *sthānivadbhāva* here in three ways : (1) आदेशेन शास्त्राभावेऽपि कार्यस्य (गुणनिषेधस्य) प्रतिपत्तिः ; (2) शास्त्रस्य (विङ्ति चेतस्य) आदेशे (अमि) ङित्वाभावेऽपि प्रवृत्तिः ; and (3) अमि ङकाराभावेऽपि तस्य ङित्वेन व्यपदेशः.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 3) सर्वप्रकारश्च स्थानिवद्भावः ... etc. An objection against the above argument. सर्वप्रकारः = त्रिप्रकारः. There is no room for स्थानिवद्भाव because the operation concerned depends upon an *al* viz. *ṅ*, and in such a case *sthānivadbhāva* is not permitted by the very rule P. 1. 1. 56 : स्थानिवदादेशोऽनल्विधौ when *alvidhi* is there, i. e. when an operation depending on an original *al* is to be effected. प्रदीव्य (from प्र + दिव् > दीव् + क्त्वा > ल्यप्), a gerund, is a case in point. Here *tvā* is replaced by *-ya* (P. 7. 1. 37 : समासेऽनञ्पूर्वे क्त्वो ल्यप् ।). Now *t* is included in *val*. So the suffix *tvā* is *valādi*. (It is also named *ārdhadhātuka*.) Now *-ya* is not *valādi* and so there is no *iṭ* (P. 7. 2. 35 : आर्धधातुकस्येड् वलादेः). Had *sthānivadbhāva* been here, *-ya* would have to be regarded a *valādi*, resulting into an awkward form with *iṭ*. Its absence shows that there is no *sthānivadbhāva* here. (And so no danger to *acinavam* from it.)

(*p*. 11, *l*. 5) यद्येवं ल्यपि गुणः प्राप्नोति. The advocate of the *sthānivadbhāva* points out a difficulty which will arise if the opponent's interpretation is admitted and the *sthānivadbhāva* is denied. The suffix (*l*)*ya*(*p*), the substitute of (*k*)-*tvā*, will no longer be *kit* if there is to be no *sthānivadbhāva*. So in a form made with *lyap* (say *praṇīya*), P. 1. 1. 5 will not apply and consequently Guṇa will result undesiredly.

So now the स्थानिवद्भाववादिन् gives his own interpretation (तस्मादिदमत्र वर्ण्यते) of the scope of *alvidhi* in prohibiting the *sthānivadbhāva*. — स्थान्याश्रये, residing in the *sthānin*. The *alvidhi* part prohibits the *sthānivadbhāva* only if

the *al* concerned is actually there in the *sthānin*. Such is the case of *t* (in *ktvā*). That *val* is always present. So the prohibition (of *sthānivadbhāva*) applies, resulting into (the desired) absence of *iṭ*. Hence the form *pradīvya*. That however, is not the case with the code-letter *k* (of *ktvā*). It is deleted at the first step. It is not there in the *sthānin*. So there is no prohibition of *sthānivadbhāva*. The *kit* status of the original continues into the substitute *lyap*. So no Guṇa before *lyap*, as was apprehended. (And, equally, though undesiredly, no Guṇa in *acinavam*.)

यद्येवम् = यदि सर्वत्रैव अल्विधौ स्थानिवद्भावः प्रतिषिद्धः स्यात् तर्हि.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 8) एवमपि गुणेनेह भवितव्यम्. A fresh objection. We accept the above interpretation. Still, there is no threat to Guṇa in *acinavam*. For, the ending *-am* has *ṅit* status coming from *laṅ*, and *pit* status coming from *mip*. And these two will cancel each other according to Pat's statement : पिन्न ङित्, ङिच्च पिन्न भवति. Once this is done, there is no hindrance to P. 7. 3. 84 : सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः. Why are you then worrying ?

एवमपि = स्थानिवद्भावेन ङित्वम् अङ्गीकृत्यापि.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 11) भाष्यकारस्येयं कल्पना ... etc. Kāt. did not foresee this concept first evolved by Pat. Hence his objection.

[5. 1]

(*p*. 11, *l*. 12) यासुटो ङिद्वचनात् सिद्धम्. This part of the *Vār*. gives Kāt.'s final view in the matter. Here इष्टम्, the unsaid subject of सिद्धम् means अमः ङित्वाभावः. There is no danger of *am* getting the status of *ṅit*. This is indicated by P. 3. 4. 103 : यासुट् परस्मैपदेषूदात्तो ङिच्च, which teaches prefixion of an augment *yās*(*uṭ*) to the finite Parasmai endings of *liṅ* and says specifically that this *yāsuṭ* is *ṅit*. Now where was the necessity of this declaration of the *ṅit* status ? The *liṅ* is *ṅit* and so its substitutes — the finite endings with the prefix *yāsuṭ* — would have automatically become *ṅit*. So this special provision indicates that here *ṅit* status is not transferred by *sthānivadbhāva* (*Mbh*. : न ङिदादेशा ङितो भवन्ति).

(*p*. 11, *l*. 14) यद्येतत् ज्ञाप्यते, कथं ... etc. The *Mbh*. raises an objection against the reply given in the *Vār*. above. Pāṇini teaches certain operations depending on *ṅittva*, e. g. the deletion of final *-s* (P. 3. 4. 99) and of *-i* (100) of the endings. (So we get forms like *paceva* and *apacat*.) If the *ṅit* status is not to be transferred by *sthānivadbhāva* how will these operations take place ?

(*p*. 11, *l*. 15) अत्र चोद्यते — न हि ... etc. Before passing on to the next part of the *Mbh*. which answers this objection, the *Dīp*. here takes an objection against the above objection itself. In the case of P. 3. 4. 99, 100 referred to here, *ṅittva* is not meant to qualify the substitutes, i. e. the finite endings. If it were so, the

final *-s* of endings like *-vas* and *-mas* when representing *laṭ* will have to be deleted and the forms *pacāvaḥ* etc. will not be available. Similarly, with the deletion of *-i*, *pacanti* will not be available. For. all these endings are *ṅit* by P. 1. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुकमपित्. No. The opponent's interpretation is wrong. It is not the finite endings but the original *lakāra* (i. e. *laṅ* etc.) which Pāṇini qualifies by *ṅittva*. As long as the original *lakāra* is *ṅit*, that suffices for forms like *paceva* and *apacat*. The objection : यद्येतत् ज्ञाप्यते ... etc. is unwarranted.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 18) अयमभिप्रायः etc. Bhar. now tries to give a justification in favour of the *Mbh*. objection which he was criticising so far. He presents the objector's view thus : Yes, yes. The objector in the *Mbh*. knows that P. 3. 4. 99, 100 do not mean ङित आदेशस्य लोपः, but ङितो लकारस्य यानि परस्मैपदानि तेषाम्. In fact that is exactly why he has raised this objection. The reason is that he thinks that making the *yāsuṭ* a *ṅit* element can best be explained as being meant for hinting that the original *lakāra* itself is thereby divested of its *ṅit* status. It is better to nip the *ṅittva* in the bud than to allow it first to pass on to the substitutes and then try to prohibit it. But if the *ṅittva* is thus done away with in the *laknra* itself (in order to facilitate forms like *acinavam*), how will rules like P. 3. 4. 99, 100 work (कथं 'नित्यं ङितः', 'इतश्च') even on the view : ङितो लकारस्य यानि परस्मैपदानि तेषाम् ? — where *ṅittva* is desired. Cf. Kaiy. : यासुटो ङित्त्वेन ज्ञापकेन स्थानिन एव लकारस्य ङिद्व्यपदेश उच्छिद्यते.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 22) किमर्थं ङित्करणं चैतत् ... etc. But then a question arises : If by investing *yāsuṭ* with a *ṅit* status Pāṇini intended to undo the *ṅit* status of the *lakāra* itself, why should he have read all these *lakāra*-s with *ṅ*, viz. *laṅ*, *liṅ*, *luṅ* and *lṛṅ* ? For other special purposes, i. e. purposes other than the prohibition of Guṇa (विशेषकार्यप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम्), is the reply. The prohibition of Guṇa is the purpose common to all cases of *ṅ*; the *aṭ* in the preterite tenses etc. are special purposes.

(*p*. 11, *l*. 24) ङिति यत् कार्यं तन्न भवति etc. (The *Dīp*. has here transposed the two sentences. The *Mbh*. reads : ङितो यत् कार्यं तद्भवति, ङिति ··· etc.). This *Mbh*., which is a sort of paraphrase of the earlier *Mbh*. sentences : न ङिदादेशा ङितो भवन्ति is meant to allay the opponent's apprehension : कथं 'नित्यं ङितः' ··· etc. Here the *Mbh*. differentiates between ङितः (स्वस्य लकारस्य) कार्यम् and ङिति (पूर्वस्य) कार्यम्. What is denied on the strength of the *jñāpaka* here is ङिति कार्यम्, operation resulting from *ṅittva* through the *sthānivadbhāva* (like the prohibition of Guṇa in *acinavam*). The other operation, ङितः (लकारस्य) कार्यम् is not denied. It takes place. If the *ṅit lakāra* itself were cancelled, rules like नित्यं ङितः would have no scope whatever and so would be meaningless. (So the opponent need not worry about the fate of नित्यं ङितः etc.) It will be noted that the rival interpretation of the *jñāpaka* (यासुटो ङिद्वचनम्) viz. स्थानिन एव ङिद्व्य-

पदेश उच्छिद्यते is ultimately rejected. Since स्थानिनः ङित्वव्यपदेशः न उच्छिद्यते, therefore ङितो यत् कार्यं तद्भवति.

(*p.* 11, *l.* 26) अनुमानं हि यन्न शक्यते कल्पयितुम् etc. Two inferences can be theoretically drawn from the extension of the *ṅit* status to *yāsuṭ* : (1) *ṅit* status is not available to the substitute endings by *sthānivadbhāva*, and (2) the original *lakāra* itself loses its *ṅit* status. The opponent rushed to the second inference, ignoring the possibility of the first, possibly because he did not expect any utility of this *ṅittva* in connection with operations affecting the element preceding the *yāsuṭ*. If it is asked what possibly such operations could be (किं च कार्यं यासुटि), the reply is : prohibition of Guṇa (e.g. in *stuyāt*) and *saṁprasāraṇa*. — But how can *yāsuṭ* by its mere *ṅittva* prevent Guṇa if the condition of *tannimitta* is there ? Well, this is not a very serious difficulty. The *tannimitta* condition can be waved (तन्निमित्तग्रहणं परित्यक्तुं शक्यम्). If the substitutes had this capacity to bring about operations affecting the preceding elements, there was no need for Pāṇini to invest *yāsuṭ* with the *ṅit* status. Hence the *first* inference : अतो यासुटो ङित्त्वं तस्यैवानुमानं स्थानिवद्भावात् ङित्त्वं नास्तीति। The *Dīp.* adds that this inference (the *first*) gives scope to rules like नित्यं ङितः while the other inference makes them meaningless.

We must admit that this *Dīp.* passage has not been entirely clear to us. (To quote one example : We do not know what the *Dīp.* means by ननु प्रवृत्त आदेशे etc.). We have tried to eke out a consistent and coherent interpretation, supplementing it by the commentary of Kaiy. Read : ङितो यत् कार्यं तद् यासुटो न किंचिदतिदेष्टव्यमस्ति, किं तु ङिति यत् कार्यं विधीयते संप्रसारणादिकं तदतिदिश्यते। तच्चेत् स्थानिवद्भावेन स्यात्, अतिदेशोऽनर्थकः स्यादित्यतिदेशः क्रियमाणो ङिति यत् कार्यं तदभावस्यैव ज्ञापकः।

Having denied the *second* inference, the *Dīp.* reiterates the *first* inference in यस्तु व्यपदेशो...यासुटो ङित्त्वमिति (*p* 12, *l.* 7). Two points are stressed in nut-shell : (1) The substitutes have no *ṅittva* of their own inherited from the *lakāra*. For if they had it (अस्ति च=अस्ति चेत्) the *ṅittva* of *yāsuṭ* would be superfluous. (2) Nor can they borrow it from *yāsuṭ* against the grammatical maxim : आगमा असमर्था इति शास्त्रे दर्शनमस्ति (*l.* 12). So the net result is that there is no prohibition of Guṇa (in forms like *ucinavam*. नास्ति यासुटो ङित्त्वेन समुदाये क्ङितीति प्रतिषेधो गुणस्य — *Dīp. l.* 9).

निवृत्ति (*l.* 9) means absence of transference (of *ṅittva* from *lakāra* to the substitutes).

(*p.* 12, *l.* 11) ननु चावयवे कृतं लिङ्गं ... etc. In this paragraph the *Dīp.* argues for and against an augment's capacity to lend its character to the element to which it is affixed and ultimately confirms the *Mbh.* : अपर्याप्तश्चैव हि यासुट् समुदायस्य ङित्वे.

[5.2]

इदमिति अपरे वर्णयन्ति etc. Bhar. now quotes a different interpretation put on the suggestive nature of यासुटो ङित्करणम् while still achieving the three objectives all right viz. (1) The deletion of suffixal *-i* and *-s* etc. by P. 3. 4. 99, 100, (2) prevention of this elision of *-s* in case of Pres. Indic. forms like *pacāvaḥ*, and (3) defending the Guṇa in forms like *acinavam* (the starting point of all this discussion).

The main difference between the two interpretations is that according to these *apare* the substitute endings also are *ṅit* (which was denied in the previous interpretation) which accounts for the working of rules like P. 3. 4. 99,100 (नित्यं ङित: ... ङितामादेशानामिदं कार्यमिति). As was to be expected, the opponent immediately is on his feet, demanding : पचाव:, पचन्ति इति कस्मान्न भवति ? At this stage a distinction between *ṅit* and *ṅidvat* is brought in. The Imperfect or optative endings are *ṅit* (by *sthānivadbhāva*) while *-vas, mas* etc. of the Pres. Indic. are *ṅidvat*. It is said that P. 1. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुकमपित् really extends only a *ṅidvad* status to the *apit, sārvadhātuka* endings. What is the difference between *ṅit* and *ṅidvat* ? *ṅidvat* is formed with the suffix *-vat* which is said to have the meaning of *saptamī* (obviously *parasaptamī*). (The formation is probably in accordance with P. 5. 1. 116 : तत्र तस्येव.) So *ṅidvat* is a grammatical element which has a *ṅit* status only with reference to what precedes; it does not itself undergo the operations undergone by a *ṅit* element but, when following, it can only exercise its *ṅit* effect on what precedes (like preventing its Guṇa etc.). The *Dīp.* adds that the *ṅit* status of *yāsuṭ* is of the earlier (पूर्वस्य) type, i. e. it is *ṅidvat* as taught by P. 1. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुकमपित्. The net result is : there is *sthānivadbhāva* when ङित: कार्यम् is concerned, but not when ङित: कार्याणि. The rest (उभयमनुगृहीतं भवति etc.) is common.

The MS is partly corrupt here. (1) The very first expression इदमिति is suspicious. One naturally expects अपरे वर्णयन्ति to be an independent, self-contained sentence. But then what would इदमिति by itself mean ? (Although the MS clearly reads इदमिति, Sw emends it to ङितमिति — that, too, with a question mark — with what advantage we do not know.) It *could* refer (in the usual manner of quoting a *pratīka* from the original text with an *iti* added) to *idam* in the *Mbh.*, but there is no such word there in the present context. So we tentatively take इदम् as referring to the अपर्याप्तश्चैव हि यासुट् ... etc., the *Mbh.* statement under discussion, and इति in the sense of 'thus, in this way' connecting it with what follows. (2) The MS ङिद्दिति (in *l.* 23) is retained in both eds. Judging by what follows, we conjecturally read it as ङि[द्व]दिति. (3) We complete the sentence with यासुटो ङिद्वचनम् though none of the eds. puts a *daṇḍa* after it. (4) There is no अन्यत्र or इतरत्र corresponding to एकत्र (*l.* 24). (5) We cannot make a head

or tail of अक्ङित इति (*l.* 27). These words seem to be fortuitous, since they are not found in this passage (एवं सत्युभयम् ... उच्छिद्येत) which has occurred earlier also (*ll.* 2-4). The word यदि, on the other hand, seems genuine but is also missing in the earlier occurrence.

[5.3]

अन्येषां ग्रन्थः etc. Here Bhar. discusses a *Mbh.* variant सुपर्याप्तः for the traditional अपर्याप्तः and shows how it is to be interpreted. Here, again, Bhar. gives two alternative interpretations. (1) यासुट् is सुपर्याप्त because it is an integral part (भक्त) of the ending-complex. So what? Bhar. does not spell out the implications of this capacity of *yāsuṭ*, How does it help the original argument? Bhar. is simply silent.

Noting this variant Kaiy. says that एनं here means समुदायम्. (अस्मिन् पक्षे ङितं चैनं करोतीति समुदायः परामृश्यते।) Again, so what?

We suggest the following as a tentatively possible interpretation. If the ending-complex (*samudāya*) had a *ṅit* status (समुदायस्य ङित्त्वे), *yāsuṭ* would have been fully capable (सुपर्याप्तः) of getting it. Then there would be no need of declaring its *ṅittva*. The fact that Pāṇini does it, shows that the endings have no *ṅittva* (by *sthānivadbhāva*) to pass it on to *yāsuṭ*.

(2) अथ वा यासुट् समुदायस्य ... etc. gives an alternative explanation (with the same variant सुप°). The *Dīp.* suggests that *liṅ* is to be supplied (वाक्यशेषः) as the subject of the predicate ङित् in P. 3. 4. 103.

(*p.* 13, *l.* 5) अपरे वर्णयन्ति ... etc. Whether this interpretation presumes अपर्याप्तः or सुपर्याप्तः as the text is not clear. If सुपर्याप्तः is intended, on the understanding that the *topic* अन्येषां पाठः still continues, the argument is not clear. If, on the other hand, अपर्याप्तः is intended, there is nothing new, since this point has been already made above (*p.* 12, *l.* 10 : अस्ति च स्थानिवद्भावेन ङित्त्वं समुदायस्य...etc.).

* * *

P. 1. 1. 6 : *dīdhīvevīṭām*

The *Mbh.* on this Sū. (which lists one more environment where Guṇa and Vṛddhi substitution does not take place) begins : किमर्थमिदमुच्यते? गुणवृद्धी मा भूतामिति। आदीध्यनम्, आदीध्यकः। आवेव्यनम्, आवेव्यकः इति। The *Mbh.* then prepares the ground for the *Vār.* thus : अयं योगः शक्योऽकर्तुम्। कथम्? Then follows the *Vār.* (1): दीधीवेव्योश्छन्दोविषयत्वाद् दृष्टानुविधित्वाच्च च्छन्दसोऽदीधेददीधयुरिति च गुणदर्शनादप्रतिषेधः which seeks to dispense with P. 1. 1. 6.

[1]

(*p.* 13, *l.* 9) एतयोस्तावद् भाषायां ... is the evidence supplied by Bhar. for the inference (on the part of Kāt.) that *dīdhī* and *vevī* are छन्दोविषय.

Bhar. (like Kaiy. who follows him) explains the *Mbh.* दृष्टानुविधित्वाच्च (छन्दस:) in two alternative ways as follows :

(1) The *Mbh.* दृष्टानुविधिश्च च्छन्दसि भवति is taken as a part of the reply (the other part being made up by the *Dīp.* अथ न चेदिदमुदाहरणं etc.) to an objection raised in the *Dīp.* ननु च भाषायाम् etc.

(*p.* 13, *l.* 11) ननु च भाषायामपि ··· etc. The objector points out that दृष्टानुविधि is no speciality of the grammar of the Vedic language. It characterises the grammar of the post-Vedic Sanskrit (*bhāṣā*) also. The very first *Vār.* in the *Mbh.*, सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे लोकतोऽर्थप्रयुक्ते शब्दप्रयोगे शास्त्रेण धर्मनियमो यथा लौकिकवैदिकेषु । attests to it. (Incidentally, though Pat. construes लोकत: with अर्थप्रयुक्ते also — and following him Bhar. too — it seems reasonable to take सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे लोकत: as one clause and अर्थप्रयुक्ते[1] शब्दप्रयोगे as another.) Then why does Kāt. mention it specifically as belonging to the domain of Chandas as such ?

The *Dīp.* तत्रायमर्थो वर्ण्यते etc. answers this question. We take the following two sentences (दृष्टानुविधिश्च ... and अथ न चेदमुदाहरणं) as antithetical (च...च). On the one hand, the dictum requires that a Vedic word to be explained grammatically must be there in the Veda. (You cannot coin a Vedic word and then explain it.) On the other hand, words like *ādīdhyanam* and *ādīdhyakaḥ* are not seen in the Veda[2]. Well, a language is autonomous; it has fixed usages (नियतशब्दसंबन्धनानि हि च्छन्दांसि). You cannot ask 'why ?'.

The difference between the grammar of Chandas and that of the post-Vedic Sanskrit (though not specifically stated in so many words by Bhar.) seems to be this, in spite of the दृष्टानुविधि: being common to the two : In the case of rules dealing with the post-Vedic Sanskrit, words derived by them may not now be current or in usage. (We can presume that they once were.) In the case of Vedic rules, however, no rules can be framed for forms not actually seen today. If you coin such forms (by framing rules) they will not be Vedic.

1. ··· and not धर्मप्रयुक्ते, — that is the idea.
2. One here expected a retort : *upalabdhau yatnaḥ kriyatām.*

If the above interpretation is really intended, it is not very satisfactory. In that case we will have to throw away a number of Pāṇini's rules which teach Vedic forms not available in the known Vedic literature.

(2) (*p.* 13, *l.* 14) अथ वा, दृष्टानुविधित्वादिति। यथैव गुणो ... etc. In this alternative interpretation it is maintained that the presence of Guṇa is as much a fact of experience as its absence and so equally demands provision in grammar. (In line 17, the MS reads न च गुणो दृश्यते, which is retained by Sw. But as it contradicts the cases of Guṇa, *adīdhet* and *adīdhayuḥ*, we follow AL and emend न to स.)

(*p.* 13, *l.* 17) अथ वा गुणदर्शनादिति। एवंप्रकाराणि...etc. Here Bhar. suggests that Kāt. may be here intending to suggest that Pāṇini could have framed a rule like बहुलं छन्दसि, just as he has done it in the case of many other features of the Vedic, where there is no consistent usage.

योगारम्भे = 'विङति च' इति योगे आरब्धे.

Bhar. completes the citation from the *Maitr-Saṁh.* (3. 6. 4) प्रजापतिर्वै यत् किंचन मनसादीधेत् by supplying the remaining portion : तदाधीतयजुर्भि: ... etc.

(*p.* 13, *l.* 24) एतन्निरुक्ते ध्यायतेर्वर्ण्यते etc. Here an objection is taken against the citation of *adīdhet* etc. as cases of Guṇa from √*dīdhī*. Yāska in his *Nir.* paraphrases twice *adīdhet* by *adhyāyat*. This shows that the forms *adīdhet* etc. come from √*dhyai*, and not from √*dīdhī*. Why do you then want a rule sanctioning Guṇa for √*dīdhī*? The reply given is that Yāska's paraphrase is only a semantic one. He does not derive the form from √*dhyai*. In support of this argument the *Dīp.* quotes another passage from the *Nir.* (viz. 2. 25) where *kṣaṇa* 'moment', derived from √*kṣaṇ*, is paraphrased by (*pra*)*kṣṇutaḥ*, a form derived from the synonymous root *kṣṇu*. (Incidentally, Bhar. quotes this *Nir.* citation in his *Dīp.* on Āhnika II also : Crit. Ed. *p.* 39, *ll.* 6–7.)

Observations : (1) It is not quite clear whether this *Vār.* takes objection to the *Sū.* on one ground only, viz. the appearance of Guṇa forms like *adīdhet*, or whether it does so on the other ground also, viz. the absence, in the Veda, of forms like *ādīdhyanam*. In other words it is uncertain because one does not know whether by *dṛṣṭa-* in *dṛṣṭānuvidhi* Kāt. meant, in the present case, the appearance of Guṇa (in *adīdhet*) or the absence of Guṇa also (in *ādīdhyanam* etc.).

(2) It appears that Kāt. knows nothing of forms like *ādīdhyanam*. They are first mentioned by Pat. (in defence of the Sū.), not by Kāt. So Kāt. probably gave only one reason (अदीधेद् ... इति च गुणदर्शनात्) for rejecting the Sū.

(3) Curiously, this seems to be supported by the *Mbh.* itself.[1] Whereas the forms like *ādīdhyanam* are mentioned in the *Mbh.* when the raison d'etra of the *Sū.* is stated, Pat. is simply silent about them when he explains the *Vār.* which rejects the Sū. If by दृष्टानुविधि he too understood दृष्टस्यैव विधिः (thus making the Sū. superflous on the ground that आदीध्यनम् etc. are not दृष्ट), he should have said so in so many words.

(4) Although Pat. does not expressly say that *ādīdhyanam* etc. do not occur in the Veda, the commentators do. Thus following Bhar. who says : न चेदमुदाहरणं छन्दस्यस्ति, आदीध्यनम् आदीध्यक इति, Kaiy. also remarks : आदीध्यनमित्यादिप्रयोगश्छन्दसि नास्ति. And so also Nāg. : एवं च वेद आदीध्यनमित्यादिलक्ष्याभावादसंभवदुक्तिकं सूत्रमिति भावः। These dogmatic statements about the absence of a particular form in the Veda appear to us rather preposterous.

(5) Both Bhar. and Kaiy. prefix their second interpretation (i. e. the argument about *adidhet*) by अथ वा 'or'. This creats an impression that the alternative is between the first interpretation (involving *ādīdhyanam*) and the second one (involving *adidhet*). But this is misleading. Actually the alternative is between (1) *both* the interpretations or (2) *only* the second one. There is an option about the interpretation involving *ādīdhyanam*; there is no such option regarding *adīdhet*

[2]

भवेदिदं युक्तमुदाहरणम्. The *Mbh.* accepts *adīdhet* as a proper example for proposing the rejection of P. 1. 1. 6 (योगप्रत्याख्याने). (The *Dīp.* has not reproduced the word अदीधेत् which follows in the *Mbh.*) It now starts a discussion about the propriety of the other example quoted by Kāt. viz. अदीधयुः.

The *Dīp.* अयं जुसि गुणः ... गाहत इति represents the following *Mbh.* which objects to the example *adīdhayaḥ* : अयं जुसि गुणः प्रतिषेधविषय आरभ्यते[2]। स यथैव 'क्ङिति च' इत्येतं प्रतिषेधं बाधते, एवमिममपि बाधेत. It is argued here that जुसि च is able to take care of itself without depending on Kāt.'s rejection of P. 1. 1. 6. For, after all, जुसि च is taught in the domain where absence of Guṇa is already taught (प्रतिषेधविषये). Still जुसि च supersedes P. 1. 1. 5 and we have Guṇa (in forms like *abibhayuḥ*). Just as it supersedes P. 1. 1. 5, similarly it will supersede this P. 1. 1. 6 also. And we will have *adīdhayuḥ* without this rejection. The rejection of P. 1. 1. 6 is not necessary for *adīdhayuḥ*.

1. Cf. भाष्यकारस्तु 'दृष्टानुविधित्वाच्च' इति हेतुं चं विना व्याख्यातवान्। तथा च तन्मते चो वाक्यालंकारे इति दृष्टानुविधीत्यारम्भ एक एव हेतुः।... (दृष्टानुविधिर्) इत्यस्यैव 'छन्दस्यदीधेत्' इत्यर्थः, न तु हेत्वन्तरमित्यर्थः। (छाया)

2. For प्रतिषेधविषय आरभ्यते of the Ed., the *Dīp.* reads °विषयमहवगाहते.

This is how जुसि गुणः प्रतिषेधविषय आरभ्यते — The suffix *jus* (P. 3. 4. 108 : झेर्जुस्) is a substitute of *jhi* and as such it has a designation *tiṅ* by स्थानिवद्भाव. Being a *tiṅ* it has a further designation *sārvadhātuka* (तिङ्शित् सार्वधातुकम्, P. 3. 4. 113). Further it is not furnished with a code-letter *p*.; it is *apit*, and as such it is *ṅit* (P. 1. 2. 4 : सार्वधातुकमपित्). So normally *jus* is a प्रतिषेधविषय; it cannot cause Guṇa. Still Pāṇini enjoins it. So Guṇa has to supersede its prohibition, otherwise its teaching would be meaningless.

(*p*. 14, *l*. 8) नैष दोषः। तुल्यजातीयं ... etc. A defence for Kāt. जुसि गुणः will supersede क्ङिति च all right, because both belong to the same class (तुल्यजातीय), in that both depend upon the suffix (प्रत्ययाश्रय). But it cannot supersede दीधीवेवीटाम् because it is not तुल्यजातीय, since it is प्रकृत्याश्रय. The prohibition is taught for the bases *dīdhī* and *vevī* irrespective of the following suffix.

But the question still remains, why जुसि गुणः supersedes only a तुल्यजातीय प्रतिषेध. The logic behind it is furnished, in terms of the *antaraṅga-bahiraṅga* relation by the *Dīp*. (*l*. 8) : तेन हि तस्य तुल्यकालता ... etc. In the case of forms like *abibhayuḥ*, the moment you think of adding *-jus* to *bhī*, both the rules, जुसि गुणः and क्ङिति च proceed to operate simultaneously (तुल्यकालता). So जुसि गुणः has there an opportunity to supersede क्ङिति च. In the case of दीधीवेवीटाम्, however, the moment you think of *dīdhī* the rule दीधीवेवीटाम् operates, making the absence of Guṇa a *fait accompli*. After this *antaraṅga* operation, when the next moment you think of adding *jus*, the जुसि गुणः (a *bahirṅga* operation), which becomes due at a later time (अवरकालेन) is ineffective. It cannot undo a *fait accompli*. (So the mention of अदीधयुः is necessary in the *Vār*.)

(*p*. 14, *l*. 10) स्यात् मतम् ... etc. Another objection, anticipated and answered. The objector will perhaps say that even a प्रकृत्याश्रय prohibition cannot take place without a suffix. Mere roots don't undergo Guṇa or *Vṛddhi* in isolation. The suffix has to appear in the picture. And so, the objector could further say, even a so-called प्रकृत्याश्रय prohibition can be equally called प्रत्ययाश्रय. So both these are equally *antaraṅga* and so the argument कथमवरकालेन ... बाध्यते will not do. The objection is admitted theoretically (यद्यप्येवम्), still. (तथापि) it is finally rejected on the technical ground that no suffix is specifically mentioned in P. 1. 1. 6.

(*p*. 14, *l*. 12) अथ वा, येन नाप्राप्त इति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh*. : अथ वा, येन नाप्राप्ते तस्य बाधनं भवति। न चाप्राप्ते 'क्ङिति न' इत्येतस्मिन् प्रतिषेधे जुसि गुण आरभ्यते। अस्मिन् पुनः प्राप्ते चाप्राप्ते च। This is another justification for reading *adīdhayuḥ* in the *Vār*. It is usually accepted that on *apavāda* supersedes another rule only when that other rule claims every example which is claimed by our (*apavāda*) rule (येन नाप्राप्ते=यस्य अवश्यं प्राप्तौ सत्याम्). Thus, wherever जुसि च seeks to operate, क्ङिति च is bound to claim it as its domain (just because *jus* is

everywhere *ṅit*), e. g. अबिभयुः, अजुहवुः. But when the other rule presents itself in some cases, and does not present itself in others (प्राप्ते चाप्राप्ते च), there is no supersession (because, in that case, it will not be entirely scopeless otherwise : सावकाशत्वं भवति). The rule दीधीवेवीटाम् is of such a nature. It will present itself when दीधीङ्+जुस् or वेवीङ्+जुस् is the case, but not in the case of भी+जुस् or हु+जुस्. Since जुसि च gets scope in this region which is not occupied (विषयो नावष्टब्धः) by दीधीवेवीटाम्, it cannot supersede it.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 14) एतत्तु मिथः ... बाधकत्वमेव भवति. Having explained the *yena nāprāpte* argument of the *Mbh*. Bhar. here offers his own comment on it which restricts somewhat the scope of that argument. He says that the *Mbh*. argument is all right if you take the view that in such cases two rules operate at a time (मिथः). But if one thinks simultaneously of all the relevant (and conflicting, too) rules (अनेकशास्त्रप्रतिसंधानं), they present themselves simultaneously (युगपद् अनेकशास्त्रप्रवृत्तिः). In such an eventuality, a rule like जुसि च will supersede all other rival rules (including, evidently, दीधीवेवीटाम्).

The *Dīp*. एतत्तु मिथः शास्त्रप्रवृत्त्यपेक्षायां ... etc. represents what is called बाध्यविशेषचिन्ता while यदा तु युगपत् ... represents बाध्यसामान्यचिन्ता. To give an example : P. 6. 1. 77 : इको यणचि cannot be said to be present wherever P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः presents itself. Similarly P. 6. 1. 87 : आद् गुणः. So on the बाध्यविशेषचिन्ता view neither of these can be said to leave no scope for P. 6. 1. 101; but together they do. One applies *iko 'aci*, the other *ād aci*. And *a*+*ik*=*ak* which is the domain of P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः. The *anavakāśatva* of P. 6. 1. 101 is not felt when we think of it along with P. 6. 1. 77 or 87 only; so it cannot supersede them. But when we think of all the three rules together, then we realize that P. 6. 1. 77 and 87 between the two have left no scope for P. 6. 1. 101. On this consideration it can supersede them.

The sentence यद्यपि कार्यमात्रपरिग्रहः etc. is not clear to us. It seems to state that even if we understand the *vidhi* (in येन नाप्राप्ते यो विधिरारभ्यते ... etc.) in the same of ' an operation ' (and not ' a rule '), we arrive at the same conclusion, viz. that there is supersession.

[3]

कथं दीध्यदिति. The *Mbh.* now asks the question : यदि तर्ह्ययं योगो नारभ्यते, कथं दीध्यदिति? This is by way of introducing the *Vār*. (2) दीध्यदिति च श्यन् व्यत्ययेन. *Dīdhyat* is subjunctive (*leṭ*), 3. sing. *parasmai*° from the Present stem. Thus *dīdhī* + *śap* (deleted P. 2. 4. 72)+*aṭ* (P. 3. 4. 94)+*t*(*ip*). Here the Guṇa is prohibited by the present rule (P. 1. 1. 6). So P. 6. 4. 82 : एरनेकाचोऽसंयोगपूर्वस्य operates, so that with the substitution of *y* for *ī* we arrive at the form *dīdhyat*. If now the rule is rejected following the suggestion made in the pre-

vious *Vār.*, we cannot arrive at the correct form. With the Guṇa-substitution a wrong form **dīdhayat* results undesiredly. (Kaiy. gives the process thus : लेट्। तिप्, 'इतश्च लोपः परस्मैपदेषु' इतीकारलोपः। 'लेटोऽडाटौ' इत्यडागमः। To this *Chāyā* adds : शपो लुगित्यपि बोध्यम्। अनेन गुणनिषेधे 'एरनेकाच ... इति यणि रूपसिद्धिः। अन्यथा दीधयदिति स्यादिति बोध्यम्।)

(*p.* 14, *l.* 18) एकदेश उदाहरणत्वेनोपस्यस्तः etc. Bhar. remarks that contrary to his usual style of quoting a complete phrase from the Veda, Pat. here cites only a part of it (viz. *dīdhyat*) ignoring the rest of the sentence. Observing that sometimes this form occurs with a prefixed *ni*, he quotes a sentence (ऐन्द्रः प्राणो ...) from the *KāṭhSaṁ.* Sw assigns the passage to the *MaitrSaṁ.* but Satavalekar reads there निदिध्यत्. (In Eggeling's *Concordance*, however, *ni dīdhyat* is ascribed, along with other texts to the *MaitrSaṁ.* also.) The *TaittSaṁ.*, on the other hand, reads निदेध्यत्. Our MS of the *Dīp.* seems to read निदेध्यत् (which is followed in both the eds.), but it could be निदिध्यत्. In all this confusion one thing is certain, viz. that Bhar. must have written निदीध्यत् since that (i. e. दीध्यत्) is the form under discussion.

The MS लेतध्यमिति is hopelessly corrupt. Sw correctly reconstructs दीधयदिति as the original reading (cf. the *Chāyā* quoted above). AL read निदेध्यदिति here also which is evidently not correct. The undesired Guṇa (meant to be illustrated here) affects the final vowel of *dīdhī*, not the first one.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 20) दीध्यदिति च श्यन् व्यत्ययेन (वा. 2). This is the solution offered by Kāt. दीध्यत् is formed, not with शपो लुक् (although *dīdhī* is read in the *ad*-class), but irregularly with *śyan* (of the *div*-class) : *dīdhī* + (*ś*)*ya*(*n*) + *a*(*ṭ*) + *t*. The *Dīp.* mentions the following features of this derivation. (1) The Udātta is thrown back on the first syllable (*dī*) by reason of the code-letter *n* of *śyan* as taught by P. 6. 1. 197 : ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यम्. So we have *dī́dhyat.* When, however, a prefix *ni* precedes (in the main clause), the verb loses its Udātta (P. 8. 1. 28 : तिङ्ङतिङः) and we get *ní dīdhyat*. (2) The Guṇa is prohibited equally by *śyan* as by *śapo luk* for the same reason of its *ṅit* status. (3) The undesired form **dīdhīyat* is avoided by invoking P. 7. 4. 53 : यीवर्णयोर्दीधीवेव्योः (rule read for this very purpose), which secures elision of the final *ī*, yielding *dīdhyat*.

(*p.* 14, *l.* 23) एवं शेऽपि (The MS श्येऽपि to be so read) ... etc. The *Dīp.* here refers to a variant in the *Vār.* viz. श (for श्यन्). It is suggested that it does not matter if *dīdhī* is regarded as taking the Vikaraṇa *śa* irregularly (*dīdhī* + (*ś*)*a* + *a*(*ṭ*) + *t*). All the three operations, (1) prohibition of Guṇa, (2) loss of Udātta, and (3) the *yaṇ* saṁdhi can take place smoothly. (The MS reads here also श्यन्व्यत्ययेन which is retained by AL. But it is similarly to be emended to श व्य°. See also Kaiy.)

(*p*. 14, *l*. 26) अथेह कथं 'मनसा दीध्यज्जुहोति' ... etc. Here Bhar. raises a point which was not considered in the *Mbh.* (nor by Kaiy. later on). It's all right for *dīdhyat*, the Subjunctive. What about *dīdhyat*, the present participle (*śatrantam*)? The *Dīp*. quotes *MaitrSaṁh*. 3. 6. 4 : मनसा दीध्यज्जुहोति where the form is so used. Here, with *śyan*, the accent (*dī́dhyat*) is explained as before but the difficulty is that with *śyan* a *num* will force itself in the participle suffix (*śatṛ*) and the resulting form in Nom. sing. will have to be *dīdhyan* as required by P. 7. 1. 70 : उगिदचां सर्व°. (The suffix *śatṛ* is *ugit* since, it has, as *it*, *ṛ* which is an *uk* — i. e. included in the *uk* Pratyāhāra.)

Here one could raise an objection. The rule P. 7. 1. 78 : नाभ्यस्ताच्छतुः prohibits *num* (although due by P. 7. 1. 70) when *śatṛ* follows a base called *abhyasta*. And the root *dīdhī* has the name *abhyasta* by P. 6. 1. 6 : जक्षित्यादयः षट्. So there is no danger of *num* here. That apprehension is unfounded. The reply to this objection is contained in the *Dīp*. योऽभ्यस्तस्य व्यवधानात्. True, P. 7. 1. 78 prohibits *num* for *śatṛ* when the latter follows an *abhyasta*. But, for that, it has to follow an *abhyasta* immediately as required by P. 1. 1. 67 : तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य. Here *śatṛ* does not follow *dīdhī* immediately; the two are separated by *śyan*. Thus the bar P. 7. 1. 78 being not there, the threat of *num* remains. (The MS यस्तस्य is read as योऽस्त्य- by AL. We tentatively read it as अभ्यस्तस्य.)

(*p*. 14, *l*. 28) अथ शः क्रियते ... etc. The above difficulty of *num* is removed if one accepts the variant *śa*. Here the two *a*'s, one of *śa* and the other of *śatṛ* combine into a single *a* (P. 6. 1. 97 : अतो गुणे), which latter can be regarded as *a* of *śatṛ* by P. 6. 1. 85 : अन्तादिवच्च. Since *śatṛ* now follows immediately the *abhyasta* base *dīdhī*, *num* is effectively checked by P. 7. 1. 78.

Readings : (1) The MS सक्रियते is read as न क्रियते by Sw, but this wholly misses the point that the alternative of *śa* is now being discussed in the context of the present participle. We therefore follow AL in reading शः क्रियते. (2) Further, the MS यछतुरनुपदेशाद् is read as षछवतुरनुपदेशात् (?) by Sw and as यच्छतुरदुपदेशाद् by AL. We follow AL in reading अदुपदेशाद् — which explains the loss of Udātta of *śātṛ* acc. to P. 6. 1. 186 — only we read य as य[स्मा] with the following *c* ($<t$) dropped as usual by the scribe. (3) Finally, after च कृते the MS reads ङिदुपदेशानिति न्यरपाद्या।स्त (AL °ति परस्याद्योऽस्ति) which we simply ignore as being obviously corrupt, irrelevant and unnecessary. Nothing is lost if it is dropped.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 3) अथापि शब्-व्यत्ययेनेति etc. The variant, viz. *śap* is shown to be suitable for the participle *dīdhyat*. The expression *śab-vyatyaya* is however explained differently here. Here *śab-vyatyaya* is taken as a Tatpuruṣa compound and *vyatyaya* taken in the sense of *vyatigamana* 'deletion'. So *śab-vya-*

tyayena means 'with the deletion of *śap*' (as taught by P. 2. 4. 72 : अदिप्रभृतिभ्यः शपः). Here also, after the deletion of *śap* there is immediacy between the *abhyasta* and *śatṛ* and so P. 7. 1. 78 : नाभ्यस्ताच्छतुः applies.

[4]

इडित्यनुवर्तमाने. Having finished the topic of *dīdhī* and *vevī* the *Mbh.* is now examining the position of the union vowel *iṭ* mentioned in the Sū. The *Mbh.* reads : इटश्चापि ग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम्। कथम् अकणिषम्, अरणिषम्, कणिता श्वः, रणिता श्व इति ? 'आर्धधातुकस्येड् वलादेः' इत्यत्र इडिति वर्तमाने पुनरिड्ग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनम् — इड् इडेव यथा स्यात्, यदन्यत् प्राप्नोति तन्मा भूदिति। किमन्यत् प्राप्नोति ? गुणः।

Pāṇini has mentioned *iṭ* in 1. 1. 6 to prevent Guṇa in forms like अरणिषम् (*iṣ*-Aor, 1. sing. Parasmai.°). When we are in the stage : अ(ट्) + रण् + इ(ट्) + स् + अम्, Guṇa becomes due for इ(ट्) by P. 7. 3. 86 : पुगन्त°. To prevent this undesired Guṇa Pāṇini includes *iṭ* in his rule. How can then the opponent say : इटश्चापि ग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम् ? The *Mbh.* आर्धधातुकस्येड् ... etc. contains the reply.

This is the opponent's idea : P. 7. 2. 35 : आर्धधातुकस्येड् ... contains (the predicate) *iṭ*. In a way it was unnecessary, for Pāṇini could bring down *iṭ* from P. 7. 2. 8 : नेड् वशि ... where it is already read. Still Pāṇini reads *iṭ* again in 7. 2. 35. The reason is that he wants to have two *iṭ* words so as to make himself doubly sure that *iṭ* continues to remain *iṭ* (इड् इडेव यथा स्यात्), and that it does not undergo any change of form like Guṇa.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 8) आङ्गं यत् कार्यं तन्नियम्यते. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : यदि नियमः क्रियते, पिपठिषतेरप्रत्ययः पिपठीः, दीर्घत्वं न प्राप्नोति। नैष दोषः। आङ्गं यत्कार्यं तन्नियम्यते। न चैतदाङ्गम्।

This *Mbh.* refutes the above suggestion of taking *iṭ* = *iḍ eva* (on the strength of the *anuvṛtti*) in order to prevent the Guṇa substitute for *iṭ* (and thus to make P. 1. 1. 6 superfluous). It is argued here that such a procedure will bar *all* modifications of *iṭ*. This is all right in the case of Guṇa which is not desired; but it will equally prevent a lengthening where it is desired, e. g. in *pipaṭhīḥ* 'desirous of reciting'. This is Nom. sing. of *pipaṭhis-* which is an agent noun from *pipaṭhiṣa-* (Desid; $\sqrt{}$*paṭh* + *iṭ* + *sa*(*n*)) with the stem final *a* deleted (P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः) when the suffix *kvip* (= O) follows. Here in the stage *pipaṭhis* + *s*(*u*) the ending *s*(u) is deleted (P. 6. 1. 68 : हल्ङ्याब्भ्यो ...), the stem final *s* is replaced by *r* (P. 8. 2. 66 : ससजुषो रुः), the preceding *i* (our *iṭ*) is lengthened by P. 8. 2. 76 : र्वोरुपधाया दीर्घः (and finally, the stem-final *r* is replaced by Visarga, P. 8. 3. 15 : खरवसान°). The desired lengthening of *iṭ* is threatened by the opponent's suggestion.

The *Mbh.* नैष दोषः । आङ्गं यत्कार्यम् ... etc. argues against the apprehension expressed above. The rule P. 7. 2. 35 : आर्धधातुकस्येड् ... is governed by the *adhikāra* अङ्गस्य (P. 6. 4. 1). So when *iṭ* = *iḍ eva* is interpreted as prohibiting all operations which would bring about a change in *iṭ*, in practice this is restricted only to operations taught in the *aṅgādhikāra* (like Guṇa). Lengthening (P. 8. 2. 76) is outside the *aṅgādhikāra*. So there is no threat to it. The *niyama* इट् = इडेव can stay.

(*p*. 15, *l*. 9) कथं ग्रहीता ? etc. Although Pat. here closes the topic of आङ्गं यत् कार्यं तन्नियम्यते, Bhar. continues it and clears up two more cases. One of them is about the lengthening of the radical *a* in √*grah-* in forms like *grahītṛ* (P. 7. 2. 37 : ग्रहोऽलिटि दीर्घः). This rule is governed by the *aṅgādhikāra* and so the *niyama* इट् इडेव will make the desired lengthening impossible. This plea is rejected on the ground that if the *niyama* operated here also then P. 7. 2. 37 will be rendered meaningless. So P. 7. 2. 37 holds its own against the *niyama*. (For our emendation न इड्रूपं of the MS ट इड्रपं, AL read न इड्रूपं and Sw (अन्य)त् इड्रूपं.)

Bhar. further takes up one more example — of *pipaṭhis*. This time it is Nom. pl. neuter. It is assumed that when we start with *pipaṭhis* + (*ś*)*i*, the stem first becomes *pipaṭhins* (with *num* by P. 7. 1. 72 : नपुंसकस्य झलचः) and with the lengthening of *i* (P. 6. 4. 10 : सान्तमहतः संयोगस्य) the inflected form ultimately becomes *pipaṭhīṁṣi* (with the Anusvāra and the cerebralisation). But now here is a hitch. The lengthening of *iṭ* takes place by P. 6. 4. 10 which is also in the *aṅgādhikāra*. If the *niyama* bars this lengthening also, how will we get *pipaṭhīṃṣi* (कथं पिपठींषि ब्राह्मणकुलानि) ?

The reply ननु च नुमैवात्र ... etc. simply denies the correctness of *pipaṭhīṁṣi*. It is maintained that the correct form is *pipaṭhiṣi*, and so it does not matter if the *niyama* prohibits lengthening here. On the contrary such a result is welcome. The main argument behind this reply is that the lengthening under discussion here depends upon a conjunct *-ṁs* as the stem final ('सान्तमहतः संयोगस्य'=सान्तसंयोगस्य महतश्च यो नकारस्तस्योपधाया दीर्घः स्यादसंबुद्धौ सर्वनामस्थाने परे। [सि. कौ]). In the present case, however, such a सान्तसंयोग is not available for *num* cannot come in (ननु च नुमैवात्र न भवितव्यम्). The rule P. 7. 1. 12 : नपुंसकस्य झलचः which provides for this rule requires that the stem should end either in a *jhal* (a consonant excepting nasals and semivowels) or in a vowel. — But does not *pipaṭhis* end in a *jhal* ? — No, because the final *-a* which is deleted by P. 6. 4. 48 : अतो लोपः is as good as present there by virtue of स्थानिवद्भाव (P. 1. 1. 57) and so the stem cannot be regarded as ending in a *jhal* (तत्र अतो लोपे कृते झलन्तता नास्ति, स्थानिवद्भावात्). (Incidentally the MS requires correction in two places here. Firstly, a न has to be inserted, preferably after नुमैवात्र, as

...20

required by the context. Secondly, नुमि कृते (enclosed by us in bracket) do not make sense here. They are better ignored or, if they are at all to be read, they should be read somewhere else, say after अङ्गस्य इति नियमात्. But even here they are not necessary.)

(*p*. 15, *l*. 13) एवं तर्हि अजन्त इत्येवं भविष्यति. The argument is continued. The opponent (the advocate of *pipaṭhīṁṣi*) now sees his opportunity. 'Well', says he, 'if झलन्तता is not there, does not matter. अजन्तता is certainly there, since now you yourself have pleaded for the स्थानिवद्भाव of the deleted *a*, so *num* can still come in (and, after it, the lengthening)'. But even this is denied by the Siddhāntin. स्थानिवद्भाव for the elided *a* was admissible when झलन्तता was concerned, because *s* there precedes *a*, which satisfies the condition पूर्वविधौ laid down by P. 1. 1. 57 : अचः परस्मिन् पूर्वविधौ. But when *num* on acconnt of the final (elided) *a* is the matter, there is no पूर्वविधि (for *num* will come after this *a*, in fact it will be its own integral final part). No स्थानिवद्भाव, no नुम्. The sentence इदमपि मिदचोऽन्त्यात् ... has to be read as follows if it is to make some sense : इदमपि मित् नुम् अचोऽन्त्यात् परस्यैव इति अपूर्वविधिः. (Incidentally, अपूर्वविधिः used in the *Dīp*. here is at first confusing. It is not used in its usual sense current in the Mīmāṁsā, as contrasted with नियमविधि and परिसंख्याविधि. Here अपूर्वविधिः=न पूर्वविधिः [but उत्तरविधिः etc.]).

Observation : There is a point that has not been made clear in the *Dīp*. When the advocate of *pipaṭhīṁṣi* says : एवं तर्हि अजन्त इत्येवं भविष्यति, it is not clear which place for *num* he has in mind. If *num* is to come after the final *a*, of what use is this to him? For that will not yield his desired form *pipaṭhīṁṣi*. It will be something else. (In fact since *a* is there only in grammar, not in reality, how could *num* be suffixed to it?) So to make the argument sensible we have perhaps to suppose that either something remains unsaid in the *Dīp*. or if it was said, is now somehow missing. The missing argument (on the part of the advocate of *pipaṭhīṁṣi*) can be something like this : True, the final *a* cannot have *num*. But the next best is the preceding *i* that can have it — on some such lines as अनन्त्यविकारेऽन्त्यसदेशस्य (Pari. 95). We can then say that the next sentence (एवमपि इकारो ...) rejects the argument we have supplied, viz. that in the impossibility of suffixing *num* to the final *a*, which though theoretically there is actually deleted, *num* be suffixed to the next available final vowel, viz. *i*.

एवमपि, 'even if this argument is admitted for the sake of argument'. Even the Pari. quoted above cannot support the opponent's claim. As long as the final *a* is there (although just theoretically, due to स्थानिवद्भाव), *num*, which has to come only after the final vowel of the stem (according to P. 1. 1. 47), cannot come after *i*, which is not the final vowel in the stem. (And since there is no *num*, there is no lengthening. *Pipaṭhiṣi* alone is correct, not *pipaṭhīṁṣi*.

So no harm if the *niyama* [*iḍ iḍ eva*] is adhered to. One can dispense with the word *iṭ* in P. 1. 1. 6.)

(*p.* 15, *l.* 17) अथ वा, असिद्धं दीर्घत्वम् ... etc. Leaving the form *pipaṭhīṁṣi* which was introduced by Bhar., we have to go back to *pipaṭhīḥ* which Pat. is still discussing. Pat. now says that we can even remove the condition : आङ्गं यत् कार्यं तन्नियम्यते. The *niyama* prohibits every operation affecting *iṭ*, whether *āṅga* or not. But then will it not prohibit lengthening in *pipaṭhīḥ* also? No. The rule teaching lengthening : र्वोरुपधाया दीर्घः (P. 8. 2. 76) is in the *asiddhakāṇḍa*. So the lengthening (strictly, substitution of a long substitute) is also *asiddha*. And a *niyama* cannot take cognizance of what is *asiddha*, technically non-existent. So the result is that in grammar *iṭ* continues to have its short length (**pipaṭhiḥ*), in actual usage it has a long vowel (*pipaṭhīḥ*).

(*p.* 15, *l.* 18) तत्र त्वयं दोषो...etc. This is Bhar.'s comment on the *asiddha* alternative proposed above by Pat. He says that if the condition of *āṅga* operation is waived and one relied on the *aśiddha* argument, there will be difficulty in accounting for forms like *alāvīt*, *apāvīt* etc. (*iṣ*-Aor. 3. sing. *parasmai* fr. *lū*, *pū*). Here, after the stem (*a-lāv-* etc.) the suffixal elements *iṣ*+*īt* ultimately combine into *īt* after the deletion of *s* (P. 8. 2. 28 : इट ईटि) and the coalescence of the short and long *i* into a single *ī* (P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः). It is now pointed out that the final operation of the *savarṇadīrgha* Saṁdhi cannot take place. For it is not taught in the *asiddhkāṇḍa* (unlike र्वोरुपधायाः दीर्घः). Being *siddha*, it will come under the jurisdiction of the *niyama* which will prohibit the single long substitute. How will you then get forms like *alāvīt*?

(*p.* 15, *l.* 19) स्यान्मतम्...etc. A reply to the above criticism is anticipated and rejected. The opponent will perhaps say that here it is not the *iṭ* that is involved as a *kāryin*; it is *iṭ*+*īṭ*. Since it is different from *iṭ* alone, the *niyama* does not act on it. The single long substitute can result unrestrained. This argument is rejected on the ground that a single substitute can be looked upon, at will, as being the same as any of the two original elements. (The *Dīp.* is obviously referring to the rules P. 6. 1. 84 : एकः पूर्वपरयोः and 85 : अन्तादिवच्च.) So one can say that this (*alāvīt*) also is a case of *iṭ* modified into *īṭ* which will go against the *niyama*. So, the *Dīp.* concludes, it is better to rely on the restriction आङ्गं यत्कार्यं तन्नियम्यते than on the *asiddha* argument.

Observation: Kaiy. apparently does not agree with Bhar. here. He quotes the case of *alāvīt*, but without referring to Bhar.'s observation he takes recourse to the *sāmarthya* argument (as Bhar. does in the case of *grahītṛ*; see above). He says : अलावीदित्यत्र तु 'सिज्लोप एकादेशे सिद्धः' इत्यसिद्धत्वनिषेधवचनात् सवर्णदीर्घत्वं भवति। It will be remembered that *s*(*ic*) is deleted by इट ईटि (P. 8. 2. 28). Now, this rule belongs to the *asiddhakāṇḍa*. So P. 6. 1.

101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः cannot take cognizance of this *sijlopa*. Thus, for all practical purposes *s* is still there. Since there is intervention of *s* between *iṭ* and *īṭ*, P. 6. 1. 101 cannot operate, hence the *Vār.* : सिज्लोप एकादेशे सिद्धः which paves the way for the saṁdhi. Now if the सवर्णसंधि could not take place because of the *niyama* इड् इडेव, then the *Vār.* conferring the *siddha* status on the deletion of *s* would be meaningless. To avoid it we have to suppose that the *niyama* does not operate in the present case (even though the सवर्णदीर्घ is सिद्ध).

* * *

P. 1. 1. 7 : *halo'nantarāḥ saṁyogaḥ*

[1]

कथमिदं विज्ञायते. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते — अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषामिति, आहोस्विद्-विद्यमाना अन्तरैषामिति ।

The *Mbh.* seeks to clarify the expression *anantara* occurring in the definition of *saṁyoga*. That it is a *nañ*-Bahuvrīhi requires no explanation. What is sought to be ascertained is whether the compound is formed with *antara* (n.) 'space, gap' as the second member (first alternative), or with *antarā* 'between' (second alternative)? The difference made by these two alternative interpretations will be brought out in the *Mbh.* later on.

(*p.* 15, *l.* 23) कुतः प्रश्नः ? ... etc. In order to explain the exact thrust of the question raised in the *Mbh.*, the *Dīp.* puts this question in the impatient opponent's mouth. Without caring to consider what the *Mbh.* says further (अविद्यमानमन्तरम् ... etc.), the opponent is on his feet when he just hears अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते ? and exclaims impatiently : कुतः प्रश्नः ? Whence this question ? What is uncertain about the word *anantara* ? You heard the word clearly (श्रुतत्वात्). So there cannot be any question as regards the wording (शब्दाश्रयः) in the *Mbh.* Such a question would be unreasonable (अनुपपन्नः).

अनेकार्थत्वादन्तर ... etc. An attempt is made, still on the *prima facie* level, to justify the *Mbh.* question, this time on the semantic level. The word *antara* (which this desputant is sure to be intended in the *Mbh.*; he does not suspect that it could be something else, say *antarā*) has many meanings (like विवर 'gap', प्रदेश 'region' etc.). One cannot be sure in what sense it is used in the *Mbh.* Hence the question in the *Mbh.* What is wrong about it ?

एषां संभवात् ... etc. (*l.* 25) rules out this possibility. The word *antara* may have many meanings. But this fact does not pose any problem because out of these, only one meaning can apply (संभवात्) in the present context, viz.

vivara 'space, gap'. Since no other meaning is applicable the question cannot be in the context of the meaning (of *anantara*) also. It is thus shown in the *Dīp.* that the real question in the *Mbh.* cannot be either with reference to the form (sound-sequence) or to the meaning of *anantara*. The real question must be different, for which the *Dīp.* now directly quotes the remainder of the *Mbh.*

Readings: (1) (*l.* 23) The MS reads शब्दाः अयस्ता°. As this is obviously corrupt, AL emend it to शब्दार्थस्ता°. But this cannot be correct since this alternative pertains to the form or the auditory impression of the word. The one about the meaning is yet to follow. We follow Sw and read शब्दाश्रयस्ता° which seems most suitable. (2) (*l.* 24), The MS reads अनन्तरः छब्दस्य प्रश्नः and Sw follows it, with correction, reading अनन्तरशब्दस्य. But the *Dīp.* which follows discusses the meanings of *antara* specifically. So, following AL, we read अन्तरशब्दस्य. (3) (*l.* 24). The MS reads य(or प)द्या — त्यवि°. Sw makes no attempt at reconstructing the original of this corrupt reading. AL read : अयं हि आस्यविवरप्रदेशः (This wrong Visarga reproduced from the MS). We cannot consider this reconstruction as it takes too much latitude and, besides, is not at all helpful. So we keep the MS reading as it is. — Incidentally, the expression बहिर्योगोपसंख्यानेषु is taken from P. 1. 1. 36. — It has further to be noted that there बहिर्योग and उपसंख्यान are not mentioned as *meanings* of *antara*, but as *contexts* in which the word is used as an adjective qualifying certain objects when it gets the designation *sarvanāman*. For the traditional list of meanings of the word *antara*, read the *Amarakośa* (3. 3. 18) :

अन्तरमवकाशावधिपरिधानान्तर्धिभेदतादर्थ्ये ।
छिद्रात्मीयविनाबहिरवसरमध्येऽन्तरात्मनि च ॥

The meanings common to the two lists are परिधान (= उपसंख्यान), छिद्र (= विवर) and बहिः (= बहिर्योग). If we agree to read the first two letters in the *Dīp.* (यद्या°) as मध्या°, then one more word is common. Finally, to take one more chance : The MS has left a blank space for one letter after यद्या. We do not know what that letter was in the original. If we supply a त्मी there and read यद्या त्य as मध्यात्मीय, then we will get one more common meaning : आत्मीय. (4) (*l.* 25) The MS reads दृष्टः इति एषां संभवात् विवरार्थ एव. Now एषां संभवात् and विवरार्थ एव go ill togther. If all meanings are possible, why विवरार्थ एव ? So AL arbitrarily read इतरेषामसंभवात् ! (We cannot understand their punctuation : दृष्टः । इतरेषामसंभवात् । विवरार्थ एवेति ...) For the same difficulty Sw simply adds an (अ) before संभवात् : He reads इत्येषां (अ)संभवात्. Both the eds. naturally connected संभवात् with the preceding इति एषाम् / इतरेषाम्. They overlooked one more possibility. संभवात् can be connected with what follows, viz. विवरार्थः '*vivara* alone is the (intended) meaning because of possibility'. In this construction एषाम् is निर्धारणार्थे षष्ठी (= एषां मध्यात्).

(*p.* 16, *l.* 1) अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते ... etc. The *Dīp.* paraphrases Pat's *antara* by *vivara*, further explained as वर्णशून्यः अन्तरालकालः, i. e. the gap or the interval of time, which is not occupied by any phonemes. Similarly Kaiy. अन्तरं विवरम्, वर्णशून्यकाल इत्यर्थः. For the argument about संभव, read *Chāyā* on this : अन्तरशब्दस्यानेकार्थत्वेऽप्यन्यार्थासंभवादाह — विवरमिति। तथा च च्छिद्रवाच्यमिति भावः। विवरं न मूर्तद्रव्याभावो विवक्षितः, हल्मध्ये मूर्तद्रव्याप्रसङ्गादित्याह — वर्णेति। According to this first alternative, (1) there should not only be no phonemes (specifically, vowels) in the consecutive string of consonants, but (2) there should also not be a gap, i. e. a pause (silence) between any two consonants to qualify them for the name *saṁyoga*.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 3) आहोस्विदविद्यमाना ... etc. This is the alternative explanation. अविद्यमाना = °मानाः. After this, वर्णाः (i. e. अचः) is understood. (The MS, citing the *Mbh.*, reads अंतरेष्विहविद्यमाना. The *Dīp.* eds. rightly ignore it and read it as आहोस्विदविद्य°.) Here the *Dīp.* mentions that Accusative was necessary (i. e. इमान् instead of एषाम्) by P. 2. 3. 4 : अन्तरान्तरेण युक्ते. The *Dīp.* however promises that the solution for this will be given later on. — After this the MS reads : केषांचिद् ग्रन्थः — अविद्यमान ... etc. We do not understand what this means (it is just the first alternative) nor the sentence किं पुनरिदं विग्रहपदं ... etc.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 6) एतदसौ पृच्छति ... etc. असौ refers to the one who had asked the question अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते. (Contrast this एतदसौ पृच्छति with नायं प्रश्नः above.) Bhar. now explains in his own way — a rather technical way — the difference in the two ways in which the word *anantara* is to be understood in the two interpretations.

Bhar. says that here we have two different *anantara* words (in the two alternative explanations). In both of them the अन्यपदार्थ (the substantive qualified by the Bahuvrīhi compound) viz. consonants (हलः), is qualified by अधिकरण i. e. the substratum of the phonemes, viz. time. But this can take place in two different ways. In the first explanation this substratum is अवस्तुभूत, i. e. अभावरूप, non-existent. The consonants are qualified by an absence of time interval. There should not be a gap between two consonants.

In the other word (अन्योऽपि) *anantara* (i. e. the word occurring in the second alternative) the time substratum qualifies the consonants in a different way. Here the time gap is not ruled out (अव्यावृत्तेन). It is permitted. The time-substratum does not necessarily stand in expectation of consonant phonemes which should occupy it (अनाधेयाकाङ्क्षेण); after this, विशेषितेऽन्यपदार्थे is understood.)

The difference between the two interpretations is this : In both, the non-separation of consonants by vowels is necessary for the name *saṁyoga*; but, in

addition, absence of a gap is also necessary in the first interpretation. It is not so in the second one. In the words of Kaiy., there is only आधेयस्य निषेधः here, while in the first there is, besides, आधारस्य निषेधः also. To put it simply, in the second interpretation, the interference or intervention (*āntarya*) of vowels alone, disqualifies a series of consonants from being called a *saṁyoga*; in the first one apart from this, even the intervention of a gap is similarly disqualifying.

Readings: (1) (*l.* 7) The MS एकोवस्तु° is read as एको वस्तु° in both the eds. In view of the above interpretation, we understand an अकारप्रश्लेष here : एकोऽवस्तु°. (2) (*l.* 8) Our text अव्यावृत्तेना' is only provisional. Both the eds. read व्यावृत्तेना° but the MS rather seems to read द्या (or ह्या) वृतेज्ञा°. We confess we are unable to make anything out of it. So we tentatively accept व्यावृत्तेना° but to give some semblance of a coherent meaning we supply, albeit unwillingly, a negative अ before it ('not ruled out'). (3) (*l.* 8) Both eds. retain °करणे- नाधेया° of the MS. Here again, a consistent interpretation requires a negative expression : either आधेयानाकाङ्क्षेण or अनाधेयाकाङ्क्षेण instead of आधेयाका°. The second (अना°) has an advantage in that we can suppose that one ना is dropped hapl. in the MS. We have supplied it. — अथ वा, एक एवायं ... etc. An alter- native to the above द्वौ शब्दौ view. It is immaterial, which alternative one adopts.

(*p.* 16, *l.* 9) लक्ष्यानुरोधात् कः शब्दः ... etc. This sentence (with पृच्छति understood after it from *l.* 7) marks the conclusion of the 'correct' presentation of the *Mbh.* question : अनन्तरा इति कथमिदं विज्ञायते? The question asked is : Which of the two *anantara* words (or, alternatively, the word *anantara* with which power) is to be accepted with regard to the actual linguistic cases? Which alternative do the actual examples favour? (There is also a possibility, though not specifically mentioned, that in some cases the first and in others the second may be favourable.)

(*p.* 16, *l.* 11) अवग्रहे संयोगसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति. The *Mbh.* which precedes this is as follows : किं चातः ? यदि विज्ञायते — अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषामिति. On being asked what difference it makes (किं चातः ?), the reply is given that on the first analysis the name *saṁyoga* will not be available in the Padapāṭha analysis of *apsu* for example (RV. 1. 23. 19 e. g.). Here the stem and the suffix are separated (अप्ऽसु), the *avagraha* sign showing that there is to be a slight pause (अर्धमात्राकालं as the *Dīp.* says) between अप् and सु in recitation. Since a gap is there (विद्यते ह्यत्रान्तरम्) which is not allowed in the first interpretation, the name *saṁyoga* does not become available. (In *l.* 11, the MS reads ह्यर्थांतरे प्रवृत्तमात्रा-. It is rightly read by the editions as ह्यत्रान्तरम्। अर्धमात्रा-.)

(*p.* 16, *l.* 12) कः पुनर्दोषः स्यात् ... etc. Supposing there is no name *saṁyoga*, so what? What harm is there? 'गुरोरनृतः' etc. replies the question.

The name *guru* for a short vowel depends upon the name *saṁyoga* for the following consonant cluster (P. 1. 4. 10-11 : ह्रस्वं लघु। संयोगे गुरु।) and once the name *guru* is there such a vowel can have a pluta substitute (P. 8. 2. 86). This is the harm on the first alternative. — ननु चाधिकरण ... etc. A question as regards the utility of the name *saṁyoga* pointed out by the opponent. P. 8. 2. 86 teaches a pluta in the context of calling a person from a distance. Naturally the name of the person is concerned and this noun will be in the vocative in this situation. Where does *ap-su*, then, which is in the Locative, come into the picture ? एवं तर्हि अप्सव्य इत्यत्र स्यात् overrules the objection. True, *ap-su* may not gain from the designation *saṁyoga*; but its derivative, *apsavya-*, may. It cannot get a pluta substitute on the first alternative (अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषाम्). (अप्सव्य is derived from अप्सु with a suffix य(त्) in the sense तत्र भवः according to P. 4. 3. 54 : दिगादिभ्यो यत्. The word अप्सु, however, does not appear in this Gaṇa.)

(*p.* 16, *l.* 17) नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्. The *Mbh.* which precedes this in the original is this : अथ वा पुनरस्तु — अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषामिति। ननु चोक्तमवग्रहे संज्ञा न प्राप्नोति 'अप्स्वित्यप्ऽसु' इति। विद्यते ह्यत्रान्तरमिति. The reply नैव दोषो etc. says that a technical name is not a decoration. It has a definite purpose. No purpose is served if in अप्सु *-ps-* is called *saṁyoga*, nor is there any harm if it is not so called. (The MS reads न चात्राप्रवर्तमानया (Instrumental) दोषो नापि प्रवर्तमानायां (Locative) प्रयोजनम्. One expected one and the same case in both occurrences. AL retain [अ]प्रवर्तमानया. For the sake of stylistics we emend it to [अ]प्रवर्तमानायां with Sw.)

(*p.* 16, *l.* 19) ननु चोक्तम् — अवग्रहे ... etc. The opponent reminds of his example of अप्सव्य, where you cannot say नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्. There *is* the defect viz. that you cannot get a Pluta there.

नैतस्मिन्नवग्रहमिच्छन्ति replies this objection. The subject is पदकाराः. Since the Padakāras, the authority on this subject, do not themselves desire an *avagraha* here, all further talk as to how it affects the name *saṁyoga* here becomes meaningless. And, further, grammar also does not recognize such an *avagraha* within words in the matter of *saṁdhi* in the jurisdiction of *saṁhitāyām* (P. 6. 1. 72). There is either extreme contiguity (संहिता = परः संनिकर्षः, P. 1. 4. 109) which gives rise to Saṁdhi operations, or no such extreme contiguity with the result that there is no Saṁdhi. An *avagraha* comes nowhere here in grammatical picture. (In *l.* 20, the MS reads °पदेसंहिताविधेयस्या°. This is read by AL as °पदेऽसंहिताविधेयस्या°, while by Sw as °पदे संहिताविषयस्या°.)

(*p.* 16, *l.* 22) अन्ये वर्णयन्ति etc. This *Dīp.* mentions a different solution given by 'others' to account for the absence of *avagraha* (and, consequently, availability of the name *saṁyoga*) in *apsavya*. It is based on the *Mbh.* on

P. 1. 1. 63 (न लुमताङ्गस्य), *Vār*. 6 : उत्तरपदत्वे चापदादिविधौ. The problem here is how to justify the palatal in परमवाचा (Instr. sing. of परमवाच्) etc.

परमवाचा is formed thus : [(परमा + सु) + (वाच् + सु)] + टा. Since the whole is named *samāsa* and consequently a *prātipadika* (P. 1. 2. 46), the two *-su* endings coming at the end of the two constituents of the compound undergo the *luk*-elision (P. 2. 4. 71 : सुपो धातुप्रातिपदिकयोः). Now, by the general rule P. 1. 1. 62 : प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणम् a suffix, even after its deletion, continues to excercise its influence. Where this is not desired, Pāṇini prohibits it by his next (63) rule : न लुमताङ्गस्य. Coming to our case, the case-ending *-su* gives the status of Pada to वाच् + सु (P. 1. 4. 14 : सुप्तिङन्तं पदम्), which threatens to continue by प्रत्ययलक्षण (P. 1. 1. 62) even after its *luk*-elision. The harm with this Pada status is that the stem final *c* will have to be replaced by *k* (P. 8. 2. 30 : चोः कुः), resulting into an undesired form *paramavākā. But has not Pāṇini provided for this in his न लुमताङ्गस्य? True, but apparently it does not suffice. For, अङ्गस्य is interpreted to mean as referring to an operation in the अङ्गाधिकार (P. 6. 4. 1ff). Since the *k*-substitution does not belong here, P. 1. 1. 63 is of no avail here. So Kāt. frames an additional rule (*Vār*. 6) : उत्तरपदत्वे चापदादिविधौ which prohibits प्रत्ययलक्षण when the operation[1] concerns उत्तरपद and is caused by the name Pada. Now the operation *k*-substitution concerns an उत्तरपद and the condition for the operation is its Pada status. So the danger is averted and the final *c* remains intact.

Pat., however, tries to dispense with the *Vār*. and to show that, with some manipulation, the desired meaning can be had from the Sūtras themselves. He says that in P. 1. 4. 18 : यचि भम् the words यस्मात् °विधिस्तदादि are to be made to continue from P. 1. 4. 13 with a further addition of सुबन्तं च. In fact this is to be done acc. to the *Mbh*. in the case of all rules which precede 1. 4. 18 from 1. 4. 14 downwards. Read the *Mbh*. : तत् (i. e. the *Vār*.) तर्हि वक्तव्यम्। न वक्तव्यम्। अनुवृत्तिः करिष्यते। इदमस्ति—'यस्मात् प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्ययेऽङ्गम्' (१. ४. १३)। 'सुप्तिङन्तं पदम्' (१४)। यस्मात् सुप्तिङ्विधिस्तदादि सुबन्तं च [पदसंज्ञं भवति।]... 'यचि भम्' (१८)। यजादिप्रत्यये पूर्वं भं भवति, यस्माद् यजादिविधिस्तदादि सुबन्तं च [भं भवति]। So, on the strength of this *anuvṛtti* not only simple वाचा, but even the compound परमवाचा (परमवाच् + आ) with the name *bha* can be justified on the strength of यस्माद् यजादिविधिस्तदादि सुबन्तं च.

The opponent argues that in a similar way the stem *ap-* can have the name *bha* as much as *apsu-* when the suffix *ya*(*t*) follows and *apsavya* is formed. Since *ap-* has the name *bha*, it cannot have the name *pada*, as *bha*

---

1. Unless it is a पदादिविधि,

supersedes it. Since there is no name *pada*, there cannot be an *avagraha*. Finally, since there is no gap, there is no problem about the name *saṁyoga*.

(*p*. 16, *l*. 23) तन्न । व्यवधानात् ... etc. The *Dīp*. brushes aside the above argument. It is all right if the name *bha* is there in *paramavācā*, because there is nothing intervening between the stem and the case ending. Here, on the other hand, the bit *-sav-* intervenes between *ap-* and the Taddhita *ya(t)*. Since *ap* (for which the name *bha* is sought by these 'others') does not immediately precede the *yajādi* suffix *-ya*, how can *ap* have that name ? (Of course this does not mean that the name *pada* is established for *ap*. No. That is already refuted. Only the *Dīp*. does not approve of this alternative argument of 'others' for refuting the name *pada*.)

(*p*. 16, *l*. 25) इह तर्हि न प्राप्नोति ... etc. The opponent now adduces what he evidently thinks are clear cases of *avagraha* and where, according to the first interpretation, the name *saṁyoga* is not available. There are two compounds, अप्सुयोनि and अप्सुमति, where the case ending after the first nominal stem is not deleted — inspite of P. 2. 4. 71 : सुपो धातु°. Kāt. has made a special provision for them in his *Vār*. 7 on P. 6. 3. 1. Since a constituent of a compound has to be separated in the Padapāṭha, there will be an *avagraha* after *ap*. So no name *saṁyoga*.

अत्रापि नास्ति अवग्रहः etc. refutes this claim. According to the rule 'समासपदानाम् ...'[1] the final phoneme of a constituent of compound is to be separated, i. e. an *avagraha* mark is to be placed after the last phoneme of a constituent of a compound. And it is well known that by a समासपद is understood not just the nominal stem; it includes the following suffix also. So the *avagraha* will be after *apsu* (and not after *ap*). Since there is no gap between *p* and *s*, there can be no harm to the designation *saṁyoga* here, even on the first alternative.

[2]

संयोगसंज्ञायाश्च शास्त्रे ... etc. Here the *Dīp*. is introducing the *Vār*. (1) संयोगसंज्ञायां सहवचनं यथान्यत्र which is to follow. The *Vār*. pleads for adding the word *saha* to the rule. Preparing the ground for this *Vār*. the *Dīp*. says that with the Sū. as it is the name *saṁyoga* will become due for each member of the consonant cluster separately.

Perhaps the opponent will say that the condition of *ānantarya* is sufficient to ward off such an undesired possibility. *Ānantarya* implies more than one

1. Cf. समासेऽवग्रहो ह्रस्वसमकालः (शुक्लयजुःप्रातिशाख्य ५. १); पूर्वेणावग्रहः । यातुमावत्। समासे च । (अथर्वप्रा. ४. ७-९)

entity. So the name also will apply to more than one consonant. संयोगसंज्ञायाः प्रत्येकं संबन्धः does not apper convincing.

This is answered on the ground that *ānantarya* is only an उपलक्षण. It is not a विशेषण. The two are defined as अविद्यमानं सद् व्यावर्तकम् and विद्यमानं सद् व्यावर्तकम् respectively. When the *Dīp.* says: आनन्तर्यं तूपलक्षणार्थम् ... etc. what it means is that this *ānantarya* is just a mark for identifying the consonants which claim the designation. It is not necessary that it should be there when the name is actually given. The result is that even consonants taken singally (while in close contact with each other) can become qualified for the name *saṁyoga*. (Kaiy. gives the example of वृद्धिरादैच्, where the name Vṛddhi applies to *āt aic* severally. Although he does not refer to the term *upalakṣaṇa*, Nāg. does. Read : नन्वनन्तरग्रहणादेकैकस्य संज्ञा दुर्लभेत्यत आह — आनन्तर्येति । एवं च तद् (= आनन्तर्यम्) उपलक्षणमिति भावः । The *Chāyā* refers to the difference between *upalakṣaṇa* and *viśeṣaṇa* : आनन्तर्येण व्यवस्थितानां निश्चितत्वेन विद्यमानानां, न तु तद्विशिष्टानाम् ··· ।)

(*p*. 17, *l*. 2) यथानन्तर्येणावस्थितेभ्यो ब्राह्मणेभ्यः ... etc. A wordly parallel. The Brāhmaṇas are described as आनन्तर्येणावस्थितेभ्यः just for the sake of identification. When the *pādya* etc. is to be actually given, they can be away from one another. Even if they are in a close group, they receive the gift each individually. Not that it is given only once, to the group as a whole. Of course, as Bhar. points out, this depends on the nature of the gift. If a single maid-servant is gifted, the gift is for the whole as such. (An expression like *ity āha*, which concludes an argument and ushers in the next part of the text to be commented on, is however missing in the *Dīp*. here.)

(*p*. 17, *l*. 6) यथान्यत्रापि. This is a *pratīka* of the *Vār*. 1. The *Mbh*. here runs thus : 'संयोगसंज्ञायां सहवचनं यथान्यत्र' (वा. १)। संयोगसंज्ञायां सहग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'हलोऽनन्तराः संयोगः सह' इति वक्तव्यम्। किं प्रयोजनम्? सहभूतानां संयोगसंज्ञा यथा स्याद्, एकैकस्य मा भूदिति। 'यथान्यत्र'। तद्यथान्यत्रापि यत्रेच्छति सहभूतानां कार्यम्, करोति तत्र सहग्रहणम्। तद्यथा — 'सह सुपा' 'उभे अभ्यस्तं सह' इति।

The *Mbh*. gives two examples to show that where a name is intended to concern a whole group as such, and not each part severally, the word *saha* 'together, jointly' is specifically put in the rule. Thus P. 2. 1. 4 : सह सुपा, which while teaching the name *samāsa*, specifically says that the name applies to the two constituents jointly (सुप् ··· सह सुपा). Read the *Mbh*. on P. 2. 1. 4 : 'सहवचनं पृथगसमासार्थम्' (वा. १)। सहग्रहणं क्रियते सहभूतयोः समाससंज्ञा यथा स्याद्, एकैकस्य मा भूदिति। [I. 377. 25] The other example is P. 6. 1. 5 : उभे अभ्यस्तं (सह) where the name *abhyasta* is intended to apply to the whole group together (e. g. *dadā*- fr. √*dā*-). (Here, however, *saha* is not there in the Sū. It is

Kāt. who insists on it. Read : 'उभे अभ्यस्तम्' (पा. ६. १. ५)। 'अभ्यस्तसंज्ञायां सहवचनम्' (वा. १)। अभ्यस्तसंज्ञायां सहग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। 'उभे अभ्यस्तम् सह' इति वक्तव्यम्।)

(*p.* 17, *l.* 6) यदि समाससंज्ञायां ... etc. The *Dīp.* here explains the remaining part of the *Mbh.* on P. 2. 1. 4 quoted above. It runs thus : किं च स्याद् यद्येकैकस्य समाससंज्ञा स्यात्? इह ऋक्पाद इति समासान्तः प्रसज्येत। इह च राजाश्व इति द्वौ स्वरौ स्याताम्। The *Mbh.* points out that in the absence of *saha*, every constituent will be separately called *samāsa*, so that in the compound *ṛkpāda* 'a quarter of a *ṛc*' a *samāsānta* suffix *a* will have to be added after *ṛc* (even though it is only a first constituent) by P. 5. 4. 74 : ऋक्पूर°. Similarly in *rājāśva* 'a king's horse' both the constituents will undesiredly get an Udātta by P. 6. 1. 223 : समासस्य. Since both the examples quoted belong to *ṣaṣṭhī* Tatpuruṣa, the *Dīp.* quotes the relevant rule षष्ठी (P. 2. 2. 8). Bhar. also adds (what is not expressly said in the *Mbh.*) that the word *rājan* in *rājāśva* will also undesiredly get the *samāsānta* suffix *ṭ(a)c* by P. 5. 4. 91.

(*p.* 17, *l.* 9) एवमुभेग्रहणे ... etc. Bhar. here draws upon a subsequent part of the *Mbh.* on P. 6. 1. 5 where Pat. says that it is not necessary to add *saha*; we can reject Kāt.'s suggestion because *ubhe* of the Sū. can serve the same purpose. It can give the same meaning. The *Mbh.* reads : तस्मात् सहग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्॥ न कर्तव्यम्। उभेग्रहणं क्रियते, तत् सहार्थं विज्ञास्यते। ... तदेतदसति प्रयोजने सहार्थं विज्ञास्यते। [*Mbh.* III. 9. 19—10. 25]।

(*p.* 17, *l.* 10) ... आनन्तर्यं नैकस्य धर्मो ... etc. Bhar. contrasts *ānantarya* with *anta* 'end' and *ādi* 'beginning'. The latter pertain to single objects while *ānantarya* necessarily pertains to two. So, without the word *saha*, you cannot prevent the term *saṁyoga* from applying severally to the two consecutive consonants — (*l.* 13) किं च स्यात्. The full sentence is : किं च स्याद् यद्येकस्य संज्ञा स्यात्? Bhar. explains the significance (अभिप्रायः) of this *Mbh.* sentence by saying that the object served by the name *saṁyoga* which has been discussed so far, viz. the name *guru* for the preceding short vowel is still available. So, why do you object ?

(*p.* 17, *l.* 14) निर्यायादित्येत्वं प्रसज्येत etc. In this *Mbh.* Pat. cites, in reply to the above question, किं च स्यात् ... six rules which contain the word *saṁyoga* and where, if एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view is adopted, there will be overextension of the rule, resulting into undesired forms. The *Mbh.* runs as below :

(1) इह निर्यायात् निर्वायात्, 'वान्यस्य संयोगादेः' इत्येत्वं प्रसज्येत। (2) इह च संह्रषीष्टेति, 'ऋतश्च संयोगादेः' इतीट् प्रसज्येत। (3) इह च संह्वियत इति, 'गुणोऽर्तिसंयोगाद्योः' इति गुणः प्रसज्येत। (4) इह च दृषत्करोति, समित्करोतीति, 'संयोगान्तस्य ...' इति लोपः प्रसज्येत। (5) इह च शक्ता वस्तेति, 'स्कोः संयोगाद्योरन्ते च' इति लोपः प्रसज्येत। (6) इह च निर्यातो निर्वातः 'संयोगादेरातो धातोर्यण्वतः' इति निष्ठानत्वं प्रसज्येत। Of these Bhar. explains only (1), (4) and (5) here.

(1) P. 6. 4. 68 : वान्यस्य ... teaches that in a root beginning with a conjunct consonant, the final *ā* is optionally replaced by *e* in the *ārdhadhātuka* optative. The rule comes under *aṅgādhikāra* (P. 6. 4. 1 ff.), so finally the *aṅga* is qualified by संयोगादेः. In निर्यायात् etc. *yā* is the *aṅga*. Now by एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा, *y* gets the name *saṁyoga* because of its contact with the preceding *r*, so that *yā-* is now a संयोगाद्यङ्ग (an *aṅga* beginning with a *saṁyoga*). So an undesired form *निर्येयात् becomes due.

(*p*. 17, *l*. 16) किं निवर्तितम् ? यायाद्वायादिति. This is the significance of the opponent's question (किं निवर्तितम् ?) : Pāṇini's object in reading the word *saṁyoga* in 6. 4. 48 is to prevent *e*-substitute when the root has a single consonant. But now, with your एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, *e*-substitute results even in *nir-yāyāt* etc. What purpose is then served by the rule ? Which form is kept out (निवर्तितम्) from the operation of the rule ? The reply is most laconic, as befitting a grammarian : *yāyāt*, *vāyat* etc. (i. e. forms without a preverb). If this condition is not laid down, then even forms like *yāyāt* will have an undesired *e*-substitute. That is averted (निवर्तितम्) even on the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, by reading the word *saṁyoga* in the rule. (In *l*. 16, the MS reads यथाद्वायाविति. It presents an excellent problem in reconstructing the original text. Thinking that what looks like a vertical stroke after थ is a *pṛṣṭhamātrā* Sw reconstructs : यथा द्वयोरिति. Though this represents correct Sanskrit words, we do not see how they help. AL, on the other hand, with a remarkable insight, reconstruct यायाद् वायाद् इति which is at once acceptable.)

अथ समुदाये ... etc. (*l*. 16) raises a counter-objection (by the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन् to the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन्) and answers it. In *niryāyāt* the radical *y* can be geminated by P. 8. 4. 46 : अचो रहा ... In the resulting form *niryyāyāt*, the *yy-* is a *saṁyoga* even according to the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view held by the opponent. How does he prevent *e*-substitution ? The reply is based on the *asiddhatva* of the reduplication (P. 8. 4. 36) with reference to the name *saṁyoga* (P. 1. 1. 7). So, for all practical purposes, the form is *niryāyāt*. Here the *aṅga yā-* is not beginning with a *saṁyoga* for the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन् and so there is no problem for him.

(*p*. 17, *l*. 19) (4) इह च दषत्करोतीति. संयोगान्तलोप by P. 8. 2. 23 : संयोगान्तस्य लोपः (=संयोगान्तं यत्पदं तदन्तस्य लोपः स्यात् [सि. कौ.]). — व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन वा. Here संयोगान्त is taken as Tatpuruṣa. The protagonist of प्रत्येकं संयोगसंज्ञा view may say that he understands संयोगान्त as a Tatpu., not Bahu. Even then he is not out of the difficulty. For it may be objected : on प्रत्येकं संयोगसंज्ञा view, *d* will be a *saṁyoga*. How can then it be its own *anta* (end) ? By व्यपदेशिवद्भाव is the answer.

(5) इह च शक्ता वस्तेति. The two are either Nom. sing. of शक्तृ and वस्तृ or 1st Fut. 3. sing. Parasmai. Here the elision of *k* and *s* results undesiredly

by स्कोः संयोगाद्योरन्ते च (P. 8. 2. 29). In these words *k* and *s* become *saṁyoga* on एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view. Also *k* precedes the *saṁyoga t* and similarly *s* precedes *t*. So, on the view that संयोगाद्योः means संयोगौ च तौ आदी च संयोगादी (तयोः), elision of *k* (in *śaktā*) and *s* (in *vastā*) before a *jhal* viz. *t* results undesiredly on एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view. (*Readings* : (1) in *l*. 21, MSSw read ककारतकारयोश्चा°, AL सकारककारयोश्चा°. We think that two pairs [*k* + *t*; *s* + *t*] are to be mentioned and so we read ककारतकारयोः सकारतकारयोश्चा°. The omission of योः सकारतकार could be hapl. (2) We follow MS AL and read सकारककारौ. We do not know what Sw gets by reading तकारककारौ in *l*. 20. Further, if the order of the *sāṁyoga* phonems was to be followed, Bhar. should have read ककारसकारौ. But he seems to have followed the order in the Sū. (*skoḥ*).)

अथापि संयोगयोरादी ... (*l*. 22). The *Dīp*. now shows that even with the usual dissolution of संयोगाद्योः as संयोगयोरादी, तयोः (cf. the *SidKau*. : पदान्ते झलि च परे यः संयोगस्तदाद्योः सकारककारयोर्लोपः ।), the defect pointed out still holds good. For *s* (in *vastā*) and *k* (in *śaktā*) do precede the *saṁyoga t* in both the examples.

Observation : It may be noted that the word *ādi* has been taken in the present context, sometimes in the meaning of ' initial (phoneme) ' and sometimes in that of ' the preceding (phoneme) '. Cf. also Nāg. : प्रत्येकसंज्ञापक्षे स्कोः संयोगावयवत्वासंभवेन षष्ठीसमासासंभवाल्लाघवाच्च कर्मधारय एवेति भावः । आदिशब्दश्च पूर्वभूतसमीपवाची. Of course you can get over the difficulty of संयोगावयवत्वासंभव by resorting to व्यपदेशिवद्भाव but that is only a counsel of despair. (In *l*. 23, the MS reads संकयोस्तकारयोरादी which is a puzzle. AL here simply read तयोः कतयोरादी while Sw reads स कयोः ? तकार(ककार)योरादी. Actually a subject is required for भवतः and this place can be filled by सकौ. How, if this really was the original reading, it came to be corrupted into सकयोः needs an explanation. Perhaps it may be due to the influence of the following तकारयोः. Incidentally, AL put a daṇḍa and Sw a comma after भवतः; it shold be *before* it. Also, Sw's addition of ककार is not only unnecessary; but it is positively erroneous. It is the two *t* sounds in the two words that are meant (and not *t* and *k*). And being two, dual is perfectly justified after *t* as the MS reads.)

(*p*. 17, *l*. 24) संयोगावादी यस्य सोऽयं संयोगादिरिति. This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh*. : नैष दोषः । यत्तावदुच्यते — इह तावन्निर्यायात् निर्वायात्, ' वान्यस्य संयोगादेः ' इत्येत्वं प्रसज्येतेति । नैवं विज्ञायते — संयोग आदिर्यस्य सोऽयं संयोगादिः, संयोगादेरिति । कथं तर्हि ? संयोगावादी यस्य सोऽयं संयोगादिः, संयोगादेरिति । एवं तावत् सर्वमाङ्गं परिहृतम् ।

From here onwards an attempt is made in the *Mbh*. to defend the view एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा by showing how there is no difficulty in the cases of the six rules, containing the word *saṁyoga*, which have been brought in by the opponent.

It is claimed that, in the first example, the compound संयोगादि is to be dissolved as संयोगावादी यस्य, 'beginning with two *saṁyogas*', and not as संयोग आदिर्यस्य as was done by the opponent. Two *saṁyogas* are necessary for *e*-substitution. In *niryāyāt* there is only one (leading the *aṅga*). So no problem with निर्यायात् on एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view.

ननु चोपसर्जनशब्दस्य ... etc. An objection against the above defence. What authority have you to dissolve संयोगादि as संयोगौ आदी यस्य? Where do you get the specific number two from? The constituent *saṁyoga* is technically an *upasarjana* (P. 1. 2. 43) and it is well known, that whatever numerical feature such a constituent may have in the phrase, it is lost in the compound. (For example, ब्राह्मणस्य or ब्राह्मणयोः, or ब्राह्मणानां all become just ब्राह्मण- in the compound ब्राह्मणधनम्.) When the *upasarjana* constituent is thus unable to convey its specific number, how do you know that संयोगौ is meant? — सत्यमेवैतत् etc. admits the force of this objection but points out certain cases where, in spite of this general practice, specific number *is* sometimes conveyed on account of certain clues which accompany these exceptional cases. This is so because, basically, on the पञ्चकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः view, the number is a property of the nominal stem and it resides therein. All that a case ending does is to help the nominal stem in expressing that number. In other words a case ending (विभक्तिः) is only व्यञ्जिका, not वाचिका, of the number (विभक्तिव्यङ्ग्या संख्या as the *Dīp.* says).

There are two views: त्रिकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः and पञ्चकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः. There are five semantic properties which go with a noun. They are: (1) *svārtha* (i. e. *jāti* or *jātyādi*), (2) *vyakti* (individual), (3) *liṅga* (gender), (4) *saṁkhyā* (number), and (5) Kāraka relations. According to the त्रिकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः the first three are denoted by the nominal stem and the last two by the case ending. According to the पञ्चकं प्रातिपदिकार्थः view, all the five are denoted (*vācaka*) by the stem while the case ending merely indicates them secondarily (*vyañjaka*).

(*p.* 17, *l.* 27) क्वचित् तु गम्यत एव संख्याविशेषो ... etc. Bhar. substantiates this statement by citing two kinds of examples. (1) Compounds where the first constituent denotes a specific measure: मासजातः 'one month old' (*lit.* one born before a month), शौर्पिकः 'purchased for one *śūrpa*-ful (of corn).' Here the number one is understood. (When more than one are intended, that number has to be used: द्विमासजातः etc.) (2) Compounds in which the *upasarjana*, by its very form, denotes a specific, viz. singular number: तावकीनः 'belonging to you (*sing.*)' etc. Here the substitutes तवक and ममक are specifically taught for युष्मद् and अस्मद् respectively when singularity of the first and the second person is intended (P. 4. 3. 1: युष्मदस्मदोरन्यतरस्यां खञ् च and 3: तवकममकावेकवचने). Cf. *Mbh.* on P. 2. 1. 1: इमे तर्ह्येकार्थीभावकृता विशेषाः — संख्याविशेषो व्यक्ताभिधानमुपसर्जनविशेषणं चयोग इति। संख्याविशेषो भवति वाक्ये। राज्ञः पुरुषः, राज्ञोः पुरुषः, राज्ञां

पुरुष इति। समासे न भवति — राजपुरुष इति। Kaiy. comments on this: क्वचित्तु संख्याविशेषाभिव्यक्तिर्भवति। यथा द्विपुत्र पञ्चपुत्र इत्यादौ प्रातिपदिकार्थ एव संख्याविशेषः। तावकीनो मामकीन इत्यत्रादेशाभिव्यङ्ग्यमेकत्वम्। शौर्पिकमिति प्रातिपदिकेन विशिष्टस्यैव परिमाणस्योपादानादेकत्वावगमः। तथा मासजात इति विशिष्टकालावगमाय प्रयोगादेकत्वावगतिः। एवमन्यत्रापि प्रकारान्तरेण संख्याभेदावसायो द्रष्टव्यः। See also the *Dīp.*, Crit. Ed., *Āhn.* V, *p.* 7, *l.* 14 — *p.* 9, *l.* 6. For अक्तपरिमाण see our note on this word which has occurred above (*Dīp. p.* 93, *l.* 8).

(*p.* 18, *l.* 2) एवमिहादिशब्दोपादानात् ... etc. The *Dīp.* says that in the present case (*saṁyogādi*), the clue suggesting that duality of *saṁyoga* is intended is the word *ādi* (in *saṁyogādi*) which, it is suggested, will be meaningless if singularity is understood. To explain : If Pāṇini had intended only one *saṁyoga*, he would have simply said संयोगादातः (of course the other words वा, अन्यस्य, धातोः and एर्लिङि are understood). And the rule would have still meant अङ्गस्य यः संयोग ... एत्वं भवतीति (*l.* 3) thus accounting for forms like ग्लेयात्. Still he reads संयोगादेः. That means Pāṇini wants here more than one *saṁyoga* if *e*-substitution is to take place. (So there is no insistence on *two*. It does not matter if there are three. That is why *styeyāt* fr. $\sqrt{}$*styai-* is a normal form. Read *Chāyā* : ... आदिग्रहणसामर्थ्यात् संयोगत्वेनानेकसंयोगस्यैवात्र ग्रहणं नैकस्येति तात्पर्यम्। अत एव स्त्यायात् स्त्येयादित्यादौ नाव्याप्तिः।) The *Dīp.* reiterates the conclusion : अस्मिन् वाक्य उपसर्जनपद आश्रितः संख्याविशेषः (viz. अनेकत्वम्) इति (*l.* 5).

The *Dīp.* justifies this capacity of the word *ādi* to suggest a meaning which is not ordinarily its own, by conferring on it the status of अर्थप्रकरण. This is supported by an example of the word *sārasvatau* occurring in the sentence सारस्वतौ भवतः. The *Dīp.* says that here the Taddhita suffix is to be understood as being added to *sarasvatau* (an *ekaśeṣa* of *sarasvān* and *sarasvatī*) and not to *sarasvān* nor to *sarasvatī* alone. This is on the basis of the Brāhmaṇa passage मिथुनं इ ... सरस्वांश्च.

The sentence यदि च समर्थो भवति उपसर्जनं (left untranslated) is difficult to construe and, moreover, redundant, too.

Observation : The objection raised and the reply given find a place in the *Prad.* also. Read : कथं वृत्तावुपसर्जनार्थस्य द्वित्वावगतिरिति चेत्, आदिग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्। अन्यथा 'संयोगात्' इति वक्तव्यं स्यात्। संयोगात् परो य आकारस्तदन्तस्याङ्गस्यैत्वमित्यर्थलाभात्। Nāg. has attacked this *Prad.*, saying that the *pūrvapakṣa* has not been presented properly. Read: कथं वृत्ताविति। अयं पूर्वपक्षोऽयुक्तः, संयोगस्य द्वित्ववत्त्वेन प्रतीतेरेव भावात्। संयोगत्वेनैवानेकसंयोगप्रतीतेः। न हि वृत्तावनेकबोध उपसर्जनान्नेति भाष्यसंमतः। संख्याविशेषानवगमस्यैव भाष्यकृतोक्तत्वात्। न त्वनेकाननुगम इति तेनोक्तमिति विभाव्यताम्।

(*p.* 18, *l.* 9) अथ वा, अङ्गस्येति ... etc. Another solution. Here stress is laid on the *adhikāra* अङ्गस्य. Also, the stand taken is that *ānantarya* is not

merely an *upalakṣaṇa*. In other words, the *ānantarya* has to be there from the beginning. The two *saṁyogas* must belong to the *aṅga*. (It will not do if one *saṁyoga* belongs to the verbal root and the other to the preverb.) In *nirvāyāt*, the first *saṁyoga*, viz. *r*, is not a part (*avayava*) of the *aṅga*; it belongs to the preverb. So there is no danger of *e*-substitution even on the view : एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा.

Observation : In the MS, some letters after आत इति च are rather obscure. There is no agreement on their reading. The MS seems to read चनयस्ति(or लि)-गय(?)कार°. Sw reads : च । न य लिंग(?) यकार°, while AL emend the passage as अवयवल्लिङ्गमाकार°. We are unable to ferret out the original text. As a result of it, although the main argument is not difficult to follow, the reasoning on which it is based is not clear.

(*p*. 18, *l*. 13) अथ वा, एतत् प्रतिपद्यामहे ... etc. Yet another solution. This time it is argued that the word *saṁyoga* in P. 6. 4. 68 is not used in its technical sense. It just means two consonants (of course belonging to an *aṅga*) in close contact with one another (संयोग इत्येष शब्द आनन्तर्यस्येहोपलक्षणम्). The word *anantara* necessarily implies *two* things. That is how we get a clue for the intended number viz. two.

A parallel of the term *prādi* is given to justify the use of the technical term *saṁyoga* in a loose sense. Strictly, according to P. 1. 4. 58, 59 the name *upasarga* is given to the words of the *prādi* list when they are connected with activity (*kriyāyoge*). But in rules P. 5. 1. 118 : उपसर्गाच्छन्दसि धात्वर्थे (which teaches the formation of Vedic words like *udvat*, *nivat* etc.) and P. 5. 4. 119 : उपसर्गाच्च (which teaches the formation of words like *unnasa*, *praṇasa* through substitution of *nas* for *nāsikā*), the word *upasarga* cannot be taken as a technical name for want of *kriyāyoga*; it has to be simply taken as meaning a word read in the *prādi* list. We similarly take the word *saṁyoga* as meaning two consecutive consonants (एवमिहापि संयोगादेरिति संयोग उपलक्षणमानन्तर्यस्य.) And in *niryāyāt* there are no two consonants leading the *aṅga*. (In *l*. 14, the MS reads °शब्द-प्रत्युप°, which is emended by AL into °शब्दो धातूप° and by Sw into °शब्दः गत्युप°. Both of them have missed the real original : °शब्दः प्राद्युप°.)

(*p*. 18, *l*. 18) संयोगावन्तावस्येति. This refutes the objection taken above (*p*. 17, *l*. 19) regarding दृषत्करोति etc. The defence is exactly on the same lines as in the preceding case. The compound संयोगान्तस्य is to be dissolved as संयोगौ (not संयोगः) अन्तौ यस्य (just like संयोगावादी यस्य in the previous case). Since there is only one *saṁyoga* at the end, no danger of deletion of *d* is there. The *Dīp*. makes it clear that all the three alternatives shown in the previous case apply here also ((1) आश्रितः संख्याविशेषः, (2) आनन्तर्यमभ्यन्तरीकृतम्, (3) उप-लक्षणं संयोगशब्दः).

(1) (*p.* 18, *l.* 19), the MS reads लोपोतस्य. Evidently taking लोपो as an incorrect Saṁdhi due to an ignorant scribe, AL emend it into लोपस्तस्य and Sw into लोप: तस्य. We however feel that पो is quite genuine here, only a dot, a sign of *anusvāra*, is missing on it. We therefore reconstruct लोपोंतस्य=लोपो ऽन्तस्य. This at once (1) removes the so-called incorrect Saṁdhi, (2) does away with a vague pronoun (तस्य), and (3) brings in its place a definite entity viz. अन्त which is to undergo the deletion.

Reading: (2) At. *p.* 18, *l.* 19, the MS reads यस्यते, which AL emend into युज्यते, and Sw into वर्ण्यते. We restore गम्यते, which is all too common in such contexts and is also supported orthographically.

(*p.* 18, *l.* 21) नैवं विज्ञायते, संयोगावादी ... etc. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: यदप्युच्यते — इह च शक्ता वस्तेति 'स्कोः संयोगाद्योः...' इति लोपः प्रसज्येतेति। नैवं विज्ञायते — संयोगावादी संयोगादी संयोगाद्योरिति। कथं तर्हि? संयोगयोरादी संयोगादी संयोगाद्योरिति।

This *Mbh.* refutes the objection taken at *p.* 17, *l.* 21, against the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view in connection with the undesired application of स्कोः संयोगाद्योः... in cases like शक्ता. The refutation is based on the following two arguments: (1) संयोगाद्योः is a *ṣaṣṭhī* Tatpuruṣa, not a Karmadhāraya. (2) आदि means an immediately preceding phoneme, not an initial part. A third point which is made clear is that if the *Mbh.* says संयोगयोरादी, it does not mean that two *saṁyogas* are necessary for each single case for the operation of the rule. That dual refers to the two *saṁyogas*, one preceded by *s*, and the other by *k* (ककारसकारभेदात् स द्विवचनेन प्रदर्श्यते as the *Dīp.* says). Incidentally, स means संयोगः. The word स is dropped in the earlier edition. — So, it has to be remembered that unlike in the previous cases, the solution here is *not* based on the dual number of the first constituent. Nāg. pertinently observes: पूर्ववद् द्विवचनान्तसमासेन न दोषपरिहारः.

(*p.* 18, *l.* 22) अथ किमर्थं प्रथमया निर्दिश्यते ... etc. A question by the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन् to the opponent. This refers to the dissolution संयोगावादी in the *Mbh.* quoted above. (It is to be noted that this *vigraha* does not occur in the original *Mbh.* where the objection was raised. It is found expressly first in the *Dīp.* only.)

एवं मन्यते ... etc. (*l.* 23). This is the opponent's reply. We can dissolve the compound as a *ṣaṣṭhī* Tatpuruṣa (संयोगयोरादी) only on the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view. We can then say, e. g., *k* is an initial part (आदि) of *kt* (in *śaktā*). But, on the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, we cannot say that *k* is a part of *t*. However, we can say that *k* is a *saṁyoga* and that it is the first (taking आदि=प्रथम) among the (two) *saṁyoga*-s (संयोगत्वेनायमादिः=अयं प्रथमः).

(*p.* 18, *l.* 26) संयोगयोरादी इति ... etc. A defence by the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन्. Well, he says, if the meaning 'an initial part' precludes a Karmadhā-

raya, I take word *ādi* in the sense of *samīpa*, i. e. a close or nearby phoneme or, to be precise, an immediately preceding phoneme.

यद्येवं, संयोगयोरादी (*l.* 26) ... etc. The opponent raises an objection against this *ādi*=*samīpa* interpretation (and taking *saṁyogādī* as a *ṣaṣṭhī* Tatpuruṣa). He understands संयोगयोरादी in the sense '*s/k* preceding two *saṁyogas*', and thinks that the rule requires that every example must have, in the case of *jhal*, three consecutive consonants : (1) *s/k*, (2) another consonant, (3) a *jhal* consonant. (All three will be designated *saṁyoga* on the view under discussion.) With this stand he raises an objection that the rule will not be applicable undesiredly in the example काष्ठतट् 'wood-cutter'.

This word is formed from काष्ठ + √तक्ष् + क्विप् in the sense काष्ठानि तक्षति (or तक्ष्णोति) इति. Here the consonant *k* of the root is dropped by the पदान्त element of the rule स्कोः संयोगाद्योः.... This will not be possible now because *k* does not precede two *saṁyogas*. (In the *Dīp*. न ह्यत्र तृतीय आदिभूतोऽस्ति we have to supply ककारः as the subject.) It is admitted that there will be no difficulty with the *jhal* element of the rule, because in a form like *taṣṭavya* we have *k* preceding two *saṁyoga*-s (viz. *ṣ* and *ṭ*<*t*). But the defect with काष्ठतट् remains.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 1) नैष दोषः ... etc. The एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन् defends his position by attacking the opponent's interpretation. If the opponent's interpretation is accepted, the rule will have no example where it will apply; it will be absolutely without any scope. The main point in the argument is that the *jhal* consonant (as well as the *anta* element) represents a condition (निमित्त). So it is to be kept outside while counting the two *saṁyoga*-s. Such being the case, let alone the case of वृक्षतट्, the rule cannot apply even in the case of तष्टव्य, for here *k* precedes only one *saṁyoga* (viz. *ṣ*). Since the opponent's interpretation leads to the ridiculous position where the rule is rendered scopeless, the objection about वृक्षतट् based on it is evidently to be rejected.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 2) तस्मात् सकारककारयोः ... etc. Having shown the opponent's interpretation of the rule स्कोः संयोगाद्योः to be unaceptable, the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञावादिन् now gives his own interpretation of the rule. According to this interpretation *s/k* has to precede only one consonant (*saṁyoga*) to make the rule applicable. (In the *Dīp*., *ādyor* was expected in the place of *āder*.) Coming to the original example *śaktā* where the opponent apprehends deletion of *k* on the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, it is now pointed out that the job of the phoneme *t* as a *saṁyoga* is to enable the preceding *k* to be designated संयोगस्यादिः. Having played that role its power is exhausted and it can no longer act in the capacity of a *jhal* as a condition. Since *jhal* no longer follows, the rule does not operate, and *k* is preserved. (Bhar. states only one alternative. But there is apparently another alternative also. One can look upon *t* as fulfilling the condition of a

following *jhal*. In that case, there is no *saṁyoga* which *k* can be said to precede. In this way also tha application of the rule can be averted in the case of *śaktā* etc.)

The *Dīp.* यद्येवं, संयोगस्यादिरित्यत्रापि न दोष: says the same thing in other words what was already said above (*p.* 18, *l.* 21): ककारसकारभेदात् स द्विवचनेन प्रदर्श्यते.

(*p.* 19, *l.* 5) तत्रेदमेवानेनोपायेन ... etc. अनेनोपायेन=संयोगादिं प्रति तकारस्य विशेषणीकरणेन. उपसर्जनपदम्=संयोग:. The *Dīp.* says that treating the phoneme *t* as a qualifier of संयोगादि amounts to saying, in other words, that संयोगादि is to be dissolved as संयोगस्यादि: (and not as संयोगश्चासावादिश्च, where you cannot make *t* qualify संयोगादि.)

Kaiy., as usual, puts the whole thing succinctly and in a clearcut way. Read: षष्ठीसमास आश्रीयत इत्यर्थः। संयोगयोरिति द्विवचननिर्देशः स्कोर्द्वित्वात् तत्समीपयोरपि हलोर्द्वित्वात् कृत: ('ततश्च नोपसर्जनद्वित्वप्रतिपादनपरं भाष्यम्' *Chāyā* and 'पूर्ववद् द्विवचनान्तसमासेन दोषपरिहार इति न भाष्यार्थः' *Uddy.*)। तेनायमर्थ: — झलि परतो यः संयोगः, पदान्ते च यः संयोगस्तस्यादि:=समीपो यः ककार: सकारश्च तयोर्लोप इति। न चैवं सति शक्ता वस्तेत्यत्र लोपः प्राप्नोति।

निर्यातो निर्वात इति (*l.* 7). This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh.*: यदप्युच्यते — इह च निर्यातो निर्वात इति 'संयोगादेरातो धातोर्यण्वतः' इति निष्ठानत्वं प्रसज्येतेति। नैवं विज्ञायते — संयोग आदिर्यस्य ... इति। कथं तर्हि? संयोगावादिर्यस्य ...।

(*p.* 19, *l.* 7) अत्रापि धातुग्रहणात् ... etc. The *Dīp.* says that by arguing on the same lines as at *p.* 17, *l.* 24, we can say that the word *ādi* suggests that संयोगादि means संयोगौ आदिर्यस्य. As there are no two *saṁyoga*-s in *niryātā* etc., there is no danger of *n*-substitution.

The justification of the एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view against the attacks of the opponent ends here.

[2.1]

कथं कृत्वा एकैकस्येति. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows: कथं कृत्वैकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति? प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिर्दृष्टेति। तद्यथा — वृद्धिगुणसंज्ञे प्रत्येकं भवतः। ननु चायमप्यस्ति दृष्टान्तः समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिरिति। तद्यथा — गर्गाः शतं दण्ड्यन्तामिति। अर्थिनश्च राजानो हिरण्येन भवन्ति, न च प्रत्येकं दण्डयन्ति। सत्येतस्मिन् दृष्टान्ते यदि तत्र प्रत्येकमित्युच्यते, इहापि सहग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। अथ तत्रान्तरेण प्रत्येकमिति वचनं प्रत्येकं वृद्धिगुणसंज्ञे भवतः, इहापि नार्थः सहग्रहणेन।

(*p.* 19, *l.* 9) न्यायादविशिष्टमेतत्. The MS reads °दशिष्ट°. As it is, though so small and apparently so innocent, it is difficult to say what this sentence should mean. अशिष्टम् (or शिष्टम्) expects शब्दात्, not न्यायात्. न्यायादशिष्टम् appears

to us very strange. So we propose to read अ[वि]शिष्टम्. To explain : We have to suppose that this remark concerns not only the *pratīka* which is quoted, but the whole of the *Mbh.* which is represented by it which we have quoted above. The *Mbh.* mentions a maxim (न्याय), supported by a parallel (दृष्टान्त), for each of the two views : (1) एकैकस्य संयोगसंज्ञा and (2) सहभूतानां संयोगसंज्ञा. The न्याय for the former view is (as will be seen from the *Mbh.* quoted above) प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः, supported by the parallel of वृद्धिरादैच्. The न्याय for the latter view is समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः, supported by the parallel of गर्गाः शतं दण्ड्यन्ताम्. Pat. does not side with any of the two views, because both are equally supported by the Nyāya-s. He simply pleads for consistency : either keep both the rules as they are (without any addition) or add *pratyekam* in P. 1· 1. 1 as *saha* in the present rule.

(*p*. 19, *l*. 10) आनन्तर्यं च संयोगसंज्ञायाम् ... etc. What follows is a sort of *udbhāṣya-ṭīkā* (if one could use such an expression). The suggestion made here is that the close contact should be taken in the sense of integration (अभ्यन्तरी-कृ-). अनन्तर is not just an accidental or temporary mark serving for identification, but it should be inherent, something more or less a constant property in order to qualify the consonants for the name *saṁyoga*. (In the technical language, *ānantarya* should not be understood as an *upalakṣaṇa* — as was done above in (2) — but as a *viśeṣaṇa*.)

The *Dīp.* gives the example of a sentence आनय तौ शुक्लवाससौ where शुक्लवाससौ is to be understood as a *viśeṣaṇa* and not as an *upalakṣaṇa*. What is meant is that the white dress is to be an integral part of the act of bringing. The two men are to be brought only when they have white clothes on. Not otherwise. (From the point of view of a compound, शुक्लवाससौ is a तद्गुणसंविज्ञान Bahuvrīhi.)

(*p*. 19, *l*. 11) न च नास्ति संभवो यत्राभ्यन्तरीक्रियते etc. It was said above (2) : ... पाद्यमाचमनीयं ... प्रत्येकं प्रत्येकं प्रतिपाद्यते, यत्त्वसंभवि तत् साधारण्येन प्रतिपाद्यते । Tha *Dīp.* now takes an opposite view. That statement, it now says, is not necessarily true. साधारण्येन प्रतिपादनम् is resorted to even where प्रत्येकं प्रतिपादनम् is physically possible. It is the intention (अभीप्सितम्) of the speaker which decides, not the possibility or otherwise. (We admit that the text is not very clear here, but we believe we have caught Bhar.'s thought.) The *Dīp.* makes use of the *śatadaṇḍana* parallel adduced in the *Mbh.* It seems to say that it is not impossible to fine each and every Gārgya a hundred (or a part of it). But that is not done. The intention is to procure a hundred from the whole group of Gargas. The fine is levied jointly, not severally. Similarly, here also the name *saṁyoga* should belong to the consecutive consonants jointly, not severally. (*l*. 13) शतरूपं यदभीप्सितं = समुदायदण्डात्मकम्.

Readings: The somewhat obscurity of the passage is due partly to the corrupt text of the MS. (1) (*l.* 9) AL अशिष्यम्; Sw (as in MS) °ष्टम् (for अ[वि शिष्टम्). (See Notes above). — (2) (*l.* 10) After नाभ्यन्तरीक्रियते the MS once more reads संयोगसंज्ञायाम् (retained by AL). It seems to be in anticipation of अभ्यंतरीक्रियते संयोगसंज्ञायाम् which occurs at the end of this paragraph. We follow Sw and drop it here as being unnecessary. — (3) (*l.* 10) MSAL आनयतौ; Sw °य ते. AL resolve the apparent contradiction between masc. तौ and neuter शुक्ले वाससी by reading आनयतौ as one word, obviously meaning 'in the act of bringing' (आनयतौ = आनयतिक्रियायाम्). (The MS आनयतौ of course simply stands for आनय तौ.) Sw on the other hand emends तौ to ते to make it neuter. We think that words शुक्लवाससाविति are missing (hapl. ?) before शुक्ले वाससी. Here आनय तौ शुक्लवाससौ is a sort of order given by the master to the servant. इति=इत्युक्ते. For similar constructions, which are rather favourite in the *Dīp.*, read: 1) 'सहस्रदक्षिणा आनीयन्ताम्' इत्येतेऽप्यानीयन्ते, 'एकदक्षिणा आनीयन्ताम्', इत्येते नानीयन्ते (*Crit. Ed.* Āhn. II, pp. 7-8). 2) 'देवदत्तशालाया ब्राह्मणा आनीयन्ताम्' इति ब्राह्मण्याद्देवदत्तोऽप्यानीयते (Āhn. VI. part I, p. 3, *l.* 24).—(4) (*l.* 11) The MS reads अंतर्भवतो, which Saṁdhi is retained in the eds. But since a new sentence begins with न च नास्ति etc., we read अन्तर्भवत: (i. e. the pausa form). — (5) (*l.* 13). MS अभीप्सितततमेव; AL °प्सितततममेव; Sw °प्सितं तमेव (our emendation °प्सितं तदेव). — (6) (*l.* 13). We supply प्रत्येकं before शतं दण्डयन्ते which is evidently missing in the MS.

Observation: On the *Mbh.* कथं कृत्वा एकैकस्य ... etc. Kaiy. observes: संयोगसंज्ञाया अन्वर्थत्वात् संयुज्यन्तेऽस्मिन् वर्णा इति समुदाय: संयोग इत्यर्थस्याश्रयणात् सहग्रहणं न कर्तव्यमित्यर्थ:. This suggestion about the name *saṁyoga* being a significant one is Kaiy.'s own. Bhar. apparently had not thought of this.

[3]

अथ यत्र बहूनामानन्तर्यम् ... etc. The question now raised for discussion is whether, in the case of a conjunct comprising three or more consonants, only two at a time get the name *saṁyoga*, or whether there is no such restriction.

The *Mbh.* word अविशेषेण, meaning without specification or restriction is vague. Hence the question: कोऽत्राविशेषोऽभिप्रेत:? Theoretically, there are two alternatives (*āhosvit*) to द्वयोर्द्वयो: — (1) Absence of the restriction द्वयो:; so बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञा and (2) द्वयोर्बहूनां च. Of these the former is प्रकरणाविशेष, because it comes in connection with the first alternative, viz. द्वयोर्द्वयो:, which is first mentioned. The second is शब्दाविशेष because it results from a pure denotation of the word अविशेषेण. The first alternative ('बहूनाम्': प्रकरणाविशेष:) is considered here while the second (द्वयोर्बहूनां च': शब्दाविशेष:), as the *Dīp.* tells us, will be discussed by Pat. later on (*Dīp. p.* 21, *l.* 15).

(*p.* 19, *l.* 18) बहूनामानन्तर्ये कथं बहूनामेव ... etc. If a cluster of three or more consonants is there, what is the reason in applying the name to the whole cluster, denying it to groups of two which are included in it? The reply is given on the basis of the parallel called समुदायद्विर्वचनन्याय. When a root is to be reduplicated (as in the Perfect), it is the first *ekāc* of it which undergoes this process (P. 6. 1. 1). Now Bhar. says that there can be many *ekāc* segments in a root. He gives the example of √*pac* where, he says, there are four *ekāc* segments: *pa*, *a*, *ac* (all three parts) and *pac* (the whole). Now even though all these four segments can claim reduplication because all satisfy the condition of being the first *ekāc*, it is the whole (समुदाय:) which undergoes reduplication (because in the reduplication of the whole the parts also automatically get the benefit of reduplication). Applying this parallel to the present case, the *Dīp.* says that although in a word like *uṣṭra* there are two two-consonant clusters (*-ṣṭ-*, *-ṭr-*) and a three-consonant one (*-ṣṭr-*), the name is given to the whole (*-ṣṭr-*), although the condition of अनन्तरहल्त्व is equally satisfied in part-conjuncts also.

निमित्तवत्स्ववयवेषु समुदाये च (*l.* 19). The निमित्त (for reduplication) is of course the status of first *ekāc*.

Readings: (1) In *l.* 19, the MS reads समुदायेन च (which is retained by Sw), while AL drop च and read simply °दायेन. We think that समुदाये च must have been the original reading. निमित्तवत्ति is of course understood (cf. च) as going with समुदाये.

(2) अथ वै° and कथं are the readings of the MS (retained in the eds.) in *l.* 20. Both are difficult to explain. अथ वै° is difficult because no alternative is mentioned in this sentence as अथ वा would have us believe. कथं is difficult because no question ('how?') is asked here. This sentence merely gives particulars which support a general statement made in the previous statement and complete the parallel. So, in spite of the fact that the readings are clear in the MS, we have reluctantly suggested अथ चै° (in the place of अथ वै°) and यथा (in the place of कथं). These, we believe, not only remove the difficulties caused by MS readings, but actually bring out the intended idea better.

(3) In line 21 a word अच्छब्दस्य (mentioning *ac* as one more *ekāc* segment) is missing. (Incidentally, for four *ekāc*-s Pat. under P. 6. 1. 1 gives the examples from √*nij-*. It is to be noted that the *Kāś.* follows the *Dīp.* in picking √*pac* for illustration.) — Lastly, we supply a word तु after पच्छब्द एव to bring out the opposition of this clause with the preceding one.

[3. 1]

समुदाये संयोगादिलोपो मस्जेः. This *Vār.* points out a defect in the समुदायस्य (i. e. बहूनां) संयोगसंज्ञा view. One derives forms like मङ्क्तुम् (from √*masj* + *tum*)

with an infix *num* (*mansj-*) with *s* deleted by P. 8. 2. 29 : स्कोः संयोगाद्योः .... Now with *n* (and not *s*) as a *saṁyogādi* on the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, deletion of *s* is not available and forms like *maṅktum* cannot be accounted for.

[3. 2]

इह च निर्ग्लेयात् निर्म्लेयात् ... etc. Here, apart from this, the *Mbh.* cites four other types of cases. Bhar. (followed by Kaiy.) comments upon them.

Here the difficulty is that, on the समुदायस्य संयोगसंज्ञा view, *-rgl-*, *-rml-* etc. are named *saṁyoga*. The *aṅga*, therefore, does not begin with the *saṁyoga* *r* — it begins with *g* and *m* respectively. (On the द्वयोर्द्वयोः संयोगः view, *g* and *m* are of course *saṁyogādi*, and so there is no difficulty in *e*-substitution.)

(*p.* 20, *l.* 1) योऽत्र संयोगः=र्ग्ल्, and र्म्ल्. यश्चाङ्गस्य=ग्ल् and म्ल्. To the question : ' where will then this rule find scope at all (तर्हि स्यात्) ? ' the reply is ' in ग्लेयात् म्लेयात् etc. ' because द्वयोः संज्ञा is not ruled out (if there are only two consonants) even on the समुदायस्य (i. e. बहूनां) संयोगसंज्ञा view.

Observation : Here Nāg. makes an original observation. He says that four of the objections in the *Mbh.* are based on the पूर्वं धातुरुपसर्गेण युज्यते view and one on the वाक्यसंस्कारपक्ष. The objections are not valid if one subscribes to पूर्वं धातुः साधनेन युज्यते and the पदसंस्कारपक्ष. Bhar. has not said anything about this.

[3. 3]

हलोः संयोग इति चेत् etc. (The initial word द्वयोः of this *Vār.* is missing in the *Dīp.* The *Vār.* extends upto द्विर्वचनम्. The predicate न सिध्यति is supplied by the *Mbh.*)

इन्दिद्रीयिषति is Desid. from इन्द्रीय-, a Denom. from इन्द्र (P. 3. 1. 8 : सुप आत्मनः क्यच् ।). Here *i* is left out of reduplication by P. 6. 1. 2 : अजादेर्द्वितीयस्य and similarly *n* by P. 6. 1. 3 : न न्द्राः संयोगादयः because *n* is the initial of the *samudāya saṁyoga -ndr-*. As a result the next एकाच् viz. द्री is reduplicated and we finally arrive at इन्दिद्रीयिषति. If the view द्वयोर्द्वयोः संयोगः is accepted, there are two *saṁyoga*-s, *-nd-* and *-dr-*. Both the initials of these *saṁyoga*-s, viz. *n* and *d* are barred from reduplication by P. 6. 1. 3. The result : no desired reduplication inclusive of *d* results.

[3. 3. 1]

न वाज्विधेः. This *Vār.* refutes the above objection. The *Mbh.* on it is as follows : न वा एव दोषः । किं कारणम् ? अज्विधेः । न्द्राः संयोगादयो न द्विरुच्यन्ते । अजादेरिति वर्तते ।

(*p*. 20, *l*. 7) एवं ह्युक्तम् ... etc. The *Vār*. 1 on P. 6. 1. 2 which follows actually runs as : द्वितीयस्येत्यवचनमजादेरिति कर्मधारयात् पञ्चमी. It says that the word द्वितीयस्य can be dispensed with, without making the meaning suffer, by taking अजादि as a कर्मधारय (not बहुव्रीहि), and अजादेः as Ablative (not Genitive). अजादेः will then automatically mean अजादेः परस्य (द्वितीयस्य एकाचः). When we come down to the next rule न न्द्राः संयोगादयः the word अजादेः is there by *anuvṛtti* (अजादेरिति वर्तते). So the Sū. will mean : *n*, *d* and *r*, when leading a *saṁyoga* are not reduplicated when they follow an initial vowel. In our example, *n* follows *i*, so it will not be reduplicated. The other *saṁyogādi* viz. *d* does not immediately follow *i*. So it is included in the reduplication. So no problem here, even if द्वयोर्द्वयोः संयोगः is accepted.

[4]

आहोस्वित् अन्यतरस्मिन् पक्षे ... etc. Calling a temporary halt to this controversy, Pat. at this stage raises a new question. Accepting for the time being both the views, he wants to ascertain whether the rule as it is is capable of both the interpretations or whether the rule will have to be so reframed as to admit of both the interpretations : अथ यद्येव बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञा, अथापि द्वयोर्द्वयोः — किं गतमियता सूत्रेण, आहोस्विदन्यतरस्मिन् पक्षे भूयः सूत्रं कर्तव्यम् ?

गतम् is here probably to be understood in the sense of 'understood, conveyed, expressed' (cf. *gamyate*, *gati* etc. in this context) or it is a figurative expression meaning 'to suffice, to manage etc.'

(*p*. 20, *l*. 10) एकस्त्वत्र न्याय्य ... etc. Bhar. just adds that there is no difficulty as far as बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञा view is concerned; but one will have to see whether the wording of the rule is capable of yielding the other view also.

गतमित्याह. This is followed in the *Mbh*. by : कथम्? यदा तावद् बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञा, तदैवं विग्रहः करिष्यते — अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषामिति। यदा द्वयोर्द्वयोस्तदैवं विग्रहः करिष्यते — अविद्यमाना अन्तरैषामिति. The *Dīp*. explains the point (अभिप्रायः) of this argument in सत्यपि बहूनां संभवे ... etc.

तथाभूतोऽर्थ इहोपात्तो ... etc. अर्थः = अन्तराशब्दस्यार्थः. अन्तरा meaning 'between two' naturally applies where there are two entities. It is totally inapplicable (अत्यन्तमसंभवी) where the entities are more than two.

(*p*. 20, *l*. 14) अनन्तरशब्दोऽविवरवाची ... etc. This *Dīp*. explains how, in spite of *ānantarya*, two consecutive consonants in a cluster of more than two will not get the name *saṁyoga* when *anantarāḥ* of the Sū. is dissolved as अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषाम्. The argument is the parallel of the समुदायद्विर्वचन (referred to above). Just as the *samudāya ekāc* is reduplicated (not the part *ekāc*-s), similarly the whole cluster of three or more consonants gets the name *saṁyoga*, not the

included clusters of two. (Incidentally the sentence अच्छिद्रौ द्वावप्यविवरौ is tautologous, since it is not meant to be a linguistic paraphrase but a logical statement.)

(*p.* 20, *l.* 16) न त्वेवं ग्रहीतव्यम् ... etc. Bhar. here sounds a note of warning. One should not be misled by the plural *eṣām* (appearing in the dissolution of the compound *anantara-*). The number more-than-two is not intended. All that it means is that if anywhere more-than-two consonants are in close contact, they all together get the name *saṁyoga*. Any two pairs, which form a part of that cluster of three or more, do not get that name. If one laid stress on that plural, then it would deprive the two consonants (where only two have come together) of that name (इतरथा हि द्वयोर्न स्यात्) e. g. in the word *vidyā*. But that, of course, is not the case.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 18) अधिकरणार्थवृत्तोऽन्तराशब्दः ... etc. अधिकरणार्थः=आधारः, substratum, location (cf. आधारोऽधिकरणम्, P. 1. 4. 45). The substratum or location is of course time, and a phoneme is the *ādheya*. (Cf. the *Dīp.* above [1] : किंभूतं पुनः शब्दस्य विवरम्? वर्णशून्यो योऽन्तरालकालः.) The word *antarā* naturally expects two entities as *terminii between* which something can be. This enables even groups of two consonants, which are parts of a cluster of three or more, to get the name *saṁyoga*,

तदभावे (*l.* 22)=अन्तरावर्तिस्वराभावे, when no vowel intervenes.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 20, *l.* 10) MS एकास्कत्र, AL एकश्चात्र, Sw एकाजुक्त. Whereas the MS is no doubt corrupt, Sw is equally wide of the mark. AL have almost hit the original text. We almost agree with them, only on orthographic considerations we prefer to read एकस्त्वत्र. — After this the MS clearly reads न्याय्य which Sw changes to न्याय (=न्याये), apparently to make it agree with पक्षे of the MS. He is evidently thinking of the एकाज्द्विर्वचनन्याय. We however emend पक्षे to पक्षो (in apposition with बहूनां संयोगसंज्ञा) as a substantive for the adj. न्याय्यः. Altogether we think our readings give a satisfactory meaning. — (2) (*p.* 20, *l.* 12) Between लक्ष्यं and सिध्यति we insert न (which is often lost in the MS). तथा means 'with the rule as it is'. However, we can avoid this insertion, if we take तथा as meaning 'by making such a change'. Since the change is to be made only if the present Sū. is *not* found satisfactory, we are inclined to insert न. — (3) (*p.* 20, *l.* 14) AL अन्तरशब्दो विवरवाची. — (4) (*p.* 20, *l.* 15) MS AL आन्तर्ये, Sw [अ] (नं)तरा (for our आनन्तर्ये). The MS is in the habit of writing simply आंतर्य where आनंतर्य was expected. — (5) (*p.* 20, *l.* 15) MS द्विर्वचनं; AL °चने. We follow Sw and supply a missing वत् to द्विर्वचन. The clue comes from Kaiy. : बहूनां चाविवरत्वे समुदायद्विर्वचनवद् बहूनामेव संयोगसंज्ञा ... — (6) (*p.* 20, *l.* 16) The MS and both the eds. read विग्र(MS Sw °गृ)हीतव्यम्. The original reading must have been simply ग्रहीतव्यम्. (न ग्रहीतव्यम् 'one should not

[mis]understand'), cf. the corresponding expression भ्रमितव्यम् in Nāg.'s *Uddy* : एषामिति बहुवचनादिति न भ्रमितव्यम् ... अन्यथा द्वयोर्न स्यात्। It seems that some copyist, who was perhaps a half baked grammarian, 'corrected' ग्रहीतव्यम् to विग्रही° because the *Dīp.* is here talking about the dissolution (*vigraha*) : अविद्यमानमन्तरमेषाम्। — Of course, if Bhar. himself wrote विग्रहीतव्यम् in the sense of 'to be (mis)understood' (not 'to be dissolved'), it is a different thing. But the use of *vi*√*grah* in such a sense is not known. — Before this, Sw reads नन्वेवं (for न त्वेवं). But it does not make sense. — (7) (*p.* 20, *l.* 21) AL एवमर्थे (for एत°).

[4. 1]

कथं पुनरत्र षष्ठी ... etc. An incidental question about the propriety of the Genitive case एषाम् (in the dissolution अविद्यमाना अन्तरैषाम्) and द्वयोः (in द्वयोश्चैवान्तरा). Bhar. actually raised this question in the very beginning [*p.* 16, *l.* 3] and promised to consider it later on. He now takes it up.

(*p.* 20, *l.* 24) यदान्तरिणौ भेदेनोपादीयेते ... etc. अन्तरिणौ = the two items serving as two boundaries between (अन्तरा) which something lies. The *Dīp.* says that the Accusative is used when two words are used as denoting two different boundaries (च ... च) between which some object lies, e. g. त्वां च मां च (अन्तरा कमण्डलुः) or गार्हपत्यं चाहवनीयं च (अन्तरा X). Where, however, such two distinct boundaries are not mentioned, but merely a word like द्वयोः (as in the present case) is used, such a word is not technically an *antarin* (boundary). For, we do not know whether *dvayoḥ* refers to two items as serving for two boundaries by themselves or whether they do so along with some other item(s) and so *dvi* in *dvayoḥ* (or *idam* in *eṣām*) has no claim to Accusative. It governs just a Genitive, which is the general case in this context. Cf. Kaiy. : यदा तु नियतावधित्वं न विवक्ष्यतेऽपि तु संबन्धमात्रम्, तदा षष्ठ्येव भवति। तदा हि न ज्ञायते, किं तयोरेवावधित्वम्, उतान्यसहितयोरित्यवधिनियमाभावाद् द्वितीयाया युक्तग्रहणान्नियतावधिविवक्षाया अभावः।

यद्येवम्, इह कथं ... etc. In the two examples quoted, the word अन्तरेण does not mean 'between'. It means 'without'. In the latter meaning also it governs Accusative, where the question of the mention of two boundaries does not arise.

[4. 2]

(*p.* 21, *l.* 5) एवमपि बहूनामेव प्राप्नोति etc. This represents the following *Mbh.* : एवमपि बहूनामेव प्राप्नोति। यान् हि भवानत्र षष्ठ्या प्रतिनिर्दिशति, एतेषामन्येन व्यवाये न भवितव्यम्। This rejects the claim made in the preceding *Mbh.* : द्वयोश्चैवान्तरा कश्चिद्ध्रियते न वा. It is held here that the dissolution अविद्यमाना अन्तरैषाम् is not capable of supporting the द्वयोर्द्वयोः संयोगसंज्ञा view. For the pairs of

two (द्वौ द्वौ) ultimately form a plurality taken together. So, न केवलं द्वयोरेव अन्तरा कश्चिद् वर्तते, but बहूनामन्तरापि. So the rival view बहूनां (or समुदाये) संज्ञा still competes and ultimately has an upper hand on the strength of the समुदायद्विर्वचनन्याय. Read Kaiy. : तस्माद्योऽसावन्तरा स द्वयोर्भवति न वेति यदुक्तं तत्रोच्यते — यदा द्वयोर्द्वयोरन्तरा न भवति तदा बह्वोऽनन्तरा इति तेषामेव प्राप्नोति। यदा हि बहूनां मध्ये भिन्नजातीयोऽज् भवति, तदा मा भूत्। तदभावे तु प्रवर्तितव्यमेव बहूनां संज्ञया, समुदायद्विर्वचनवदित्यर्थः।

(*p.* 21, *l.* 6) केचिदेषामिति ... etc. Bhar. begins the interpretation of the *Mbh.* with clearing a possible misunderstanding. If the *Mbh.* says बहूनामेव प्राप्नोति, it is not because of the plural expression *eṣām* as some hold. No. For, firstly, the definition (वाक्य) is primarily concerned with close contact. No vowel should intervene between consecutive consonants — that is where the main interest of the definition lies. It does not wish to lay any stress on the number. Besides, if there were such a stress on plurality (more-than-two-ness), there will be no name *saṁyoga* where there happen to be only two consonants in close contact (to name just one example, *asva* ' poor '), which is not desired.

(*p.* 21, *l.* 9) तस्मादेतेनैतत् प्रतिपादयति etc. Here Bhar. gives what he thinks is the correct reason for the *Mbh.* statement : एवमपि बहूनामेव प्राप्नोति. We have already given this interpretation above when explaining the *Mbh. pratīka.* With the *Dīp.* योऽसावन्तरा इति स द्वयोश्च बहूनां च ... प्रवर्तते, cf. the *Prad.* (quoted above) तस्माद्योऽसावनन्तरा ... तेषामेव प्राप्नोति. This may be thus illustrated by a concrete example, say कृत्स्न. This word has three consecutive consonants : *t, s, n.* On the view द्वयोर्द्वयोरानन्तर्यम् we can say that there is आनन्तर्य between (i) $t+s$ and (ii) $s+n$. (If the definite *antarin*-s are not known, $t+sn$, or $ts+n$ are also admissible.) But along with this, there is also बहूनामानन्तर्य, since no vowel intervenes in between all these three consonants taken together. What, then, prevents the name *saṁyoga* from applying to the whole (like *-tsn-* here) ? — asks the *Dīp.* : किमर्थं संयोगसंज्ञा न प्रवर्तते.

Observation : Curiously, the *Mbh.* here states only the negative side of the argument when it says : एतेषामन्येन व्यवाये न भवितव्यम्. It somehow does not expressly say the positive side (which is really meant to be said) viz. (something like) ... अव्यवाये तु भवितव्यमेव. Bhar. and Kaiy. have filled this desideratum.

(*p.* 21, *l.* 11) त्रयाणां ह्याद्यन्तौ. We do not understand the purpose of this statement. Here व्यवहितौ means हला व्यवहितौ ' separated by a consonant.' But one may ask : ' so what ? ' It is only the intervention of a vowel that disqualifies a group of consonants from being called a *samyoga*. We fail to understand the significance of this statement.

अन्त्यात् पूर्वो मस्जेरिति. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : अस्तु तर्हि समुदाये संज्ञा। ननु चोक्तं ' समुदाये संयोगादिलोपो मस्जेः (वा. २) ' इति। नैष

दोषः। वक्ष्यत्येतत् — 'अन्त्यात् पूर्वो मस्जेर्मिदनुषङ्गादिलोपार्थम्' (पा. १. १. ४७ वा. २) इति।

The question was raised in the *Mbh.* (above *p.* 19, *l.* 17): अथ यत्र बहूनामानन्तर्यं किं तत्र द्वयोर्द्वयोः संज्ञा भवति, आहोस्विदविशेषेण? The *Mbh.* now takes the stand समुदाये संयोगसंज्ञा, whereupon the opponent immediately reminds of his objection taken previously in *Vār.* 2, viz. that on that view forms like मङ्क्ता cannot be established because *s* cannot be deleted as it is not now *saṁyogādi*. The *Mbh.* now refers to the *Vār.* 2: अन्त्यात् पूर्वो ... etc. (on P. 1. 1. 47).

The *Vār.* says that P. 1. 1. 47: मिदचोऽन्त्यात् परः be modified in the case of *masj-* to the effect that an augment with a code-letter *m* (like *num* in our case) instead of coming after the final vowel as required by the Sū., comes before the final consonant of *masj-*. This helps the deletion of the penultimate *n* (अनुषङ्ग) in *magna* and that of *s* in *maṅktā* etc. Thus:

$$masj+na=masnj^{1}+na=maOOj^{2}+na=magna^{3}$$

Similarly, *masj+tā=masnj+tā=maOnj+tā=maṅk tā.* (*n* is not deleted here, as *tā* is not *kit*).

(*p.* 21, *l.* 14) तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम् ... etc. That *Vār.* serves an additional purpose. Besides ensuring elision of *s*, it is also necessary for the elision of the penultimate *n*.

Readings: (1) (*p.* 20, *l.* 25) Here and also in the next line, Sw [अ]न्तरि(त)रूपेण. — (2) (*p.* 20, *l.* 26) MS अनंतरत्युक्ते; AL Sw अनन्तरा(Sw °र) इत्युक्ते. — (3) (*p.* 21, *l.* 3) MS उभयार्थेनावियोगे; Sw °र्थौ, विनायोगे. — (4) (*p.* 21, *l.* 7) MS यत्प्रत्याख्य। तंतर्यम्; AL यत् प्रत्याख्य आनन्त°; Sw यत्प्रत्याख्यानन्त°. We not very confidently emend the text into यावत्प्र°). — (5) (*p.* 21, *l.* 8) AL स्वरादिषु (for अस्वा°). — (6) (*p.* 21, *l.* 10) MS बहूनां न चेद्; AL न बहूनाम्। न चेद् — (7) (*p.* 21, *l.* 11) Sw हि, आद्यन्तौ. — (8) (*p.* 21, *l.* 11) MS AL तु यः (for (मध्)यः (as in Sw).

[4. 3]

अथ वा अविशेषेण ... etc. A third view. The name *saṁyoga* applies to more-than-two and also to two (forming a part of the whole) at a time without any restriction. The *Mbh.* adds: तत्र द्वयोर्या संयोगसंज्ञा तदाश्रयो लोपो भविष्यति. So in *mansj+tā*, the two viz. *-sj* can be looked upon as a *saṁyoga*, *s* is *saṁyogādi*,

---

1. Nasal infixion by P. 7. 1. 60: मस्जिनशोर्झलि.
2. Deletion of *s* by P. 8.2.29: स्कोः संयोगाद्योः ···, of *n* by P. 6. 4. 26: अनिदितां हल ····.
3. *j>g*, P. 8. 2. 30: चोः कुः.

and so it can be deleted easily. (On this द्वयोः संज्ञा view, the *Vār*. अन्त्यात् पूर्वो... is not necessary as far as the deletion of *s* is concerned.)

(*p*. 21, *l*. 16) कथं कृत्वेदमुच्यते ... etc. The *Dīp*. raises an objection against द्वयोः संज्ञा (besides बहूनां संज्ञा). It has already been said, more than once, that when an operation is claimed by the whole and also by the parts, it is the whole alone which gets it, on the parallel of the समुदायद्विर्वचन. So the *samudāya* alone is entitled to the name *saṁyoga*. How is now a part to share it ?

एषोऽभिप्रायः (*l*. 17) etc. gives a justification. It is pleaded that the two cases are not alike. Since there is a difference between the two cases, they cannot be treated alike. What is good for reduplication is not good for the name *saṁyoga*. So the parallel of समुदायद्विर्वचन will not do here (दृष्टान्तो द्विर्वचनं न भवति). The following two points constitute the difference between the two :

(1) When the whole is repeated, we can say that by that very act a part also is repeated. After all, it is the question of auditory perception. And one does hear the part reduplicated when actually it is the whole which is reduplicated. The part does not require a reduplication to the exclusion of the reduplication of the whole. But that is not the case with the name *saṁyoga*. If the whole alone (say *-nsj-* in *mansj-*) gets the name *saṁyoga*, it is not automatically of any use to *-sj*. For the deletion of *s*, the name is necessary to the part *-sj* also. A secondary or indirect name will not do. The part must have it in its own right. A name is not just an embellishment. It must lead to the desired operation.

(2) Once you have utilised the vowel (*ac*) to qualify the condition of *ekāc* with respect to the whole, no vowel is left (अचोऽपहृतत्वात्) and so the part *ekāc*-s cannot undergo a reduplication. They have to be content with the indirect or secondary reduplication of the whole. (Also, if a part is first reduplicated, no other part or even the whole can be reduplicated, अचोऽपहृतत्वात्.) But there is no such difficulty (विरोधः) in the matter of the name *saṁyoga*. Every part (a cluster of two) can have the name, without it being denied to the other part or the whole (अस्ति हि संभवो यत् समुदायस्य च स्यादवयवानां च).

Kaiy. as usual brings out the whole idea clearly and concisely thus : कार्यार्थत्वात् संज्ञायाः, विरोधाभावाद्, एकया संज्ञया सर्वेषामनुग्रहासिद्ध्या, द्विर्वचनेन वैषम्याद्-विशेषेणेत्युक्तम्.

Observation : The MS is corrupt in a part of this section, besides a repetion of the portion of the text from वमिह द्विर्वं up to मपि, अथ संयोग. The eds. have of course printed the text dropping the repetition, but still there is no agreement between the two eds. over some part of the text. We give below particularly one sentence, where it is difficult to reconstruct the text according to AL, Sw

(who has mostly retained the MS readings, only adding question marks) along with the Crit. Ed. :

AL : एवमिह द्विर्वचनवत्। यदि समुदायद्वारकं कार्यमवयवानामपि, अन्यत्संयोगकार्यम्। अथ च प्रतिपद्यन्ते सहभूतानामवयवाः संयोगसंज्ञेति दृष्टान्तो द्विर्वचने भवति। ... द्विर्वचने विरोधे न शक्यम् ... अचोऽपहृतत्वात् ...

Sw : एवमिह द्विर्वचनवद्यदि समुदायदारकं कार्यमवयवानामप्य संयोगकार्यम् (?)। अथ न प्रतिपद्यन्ते सहभूतानामवयवसंज्ञेति दृष्टान्तो द्विर्वचनं न भवति (?)...द्विर्वचने (अ)विरोधेन शक्यम् ... अयोपहृतत्वात् ...

Cr. Ed. : एवमिह द्विर्वचनवत् यदि समुदायद्वारकं कार्यमवयवानामपि, अथ संयोग-कार्यं न प्रतिपद्यन्ते सहभूतानामवयवा इति दृष्टान्तो द्विर्वचनं न भवति ... द्विर्वचने विरोधे न शक्यम् ... ऽचोऽपहृतत्वात् ...

Our text is based on the consideration of context, capacity to give a coherent explanation and the explanation given by Kaiy. (as amplified by Nāg. and the *Chāyā*). It is not very satisfactory, but it makes some improvement on the MS and older eds.

Other Readings :

(1) (*p.* 21, *l.* 15) MS विधास्यते. — (2) (*p.* 21, *l.* 15) *Mbh.* Ed. बहूना-मपि; AL °नामपि इति. — (3) (*p.* 21, *l.* 17) MS एकाचो च; Sw °चश्च. — (4) (*p.* 21, *l.* 19) MS AL °पत्तिस्तुल्या. — (5) (*p.* 21, *l.* 21) MS °पद्यमानोर्थिनोवयव°.

[4.4]

यदप्युच्यते etc. Here the *Mbh.* repeats its own objections previously taken (*p.* 20, *l.* 1) against the समुदाये संज्ञा view and answers them. It runs thus : यदप्युच्यते 'इह च निर्ग्लैयात् निर्ग्लायात् ... "वान्यस्य संयोगादेः" इत्येत्वं न प्राप्नोति' इति। अङ्गेन संयोगादिं विशेषयिष्यामः — अङ्गस्य संयोगादेरिति। एवं तावत् सर्वमाङ्गं परिहृतम्। etc.

(*p.* 21, *l.* 26) अयं ग्रन्थोऽस्मात् ... etc. Before explaining the *Mbh.* Bhar. draws attention to the misplaced position of the present *Mbh.* passage and suggests its logical place. It will be remembered that the objections to the समुदाये संज्ञा view which are now being replied were taken immediately after the *Vār.* (2) objection : समुदाये संयोगादि .... That sequence has not been followed in the rebuttal of the objections. For, after the rebuttal of the *Vār.* in the *Mbh.* नैष दोषः।... अन्त्यात् पूर्वो मस्जेः etc. (*p.* 21, *l.* 13), the rebuttal of the objections about निर्ग्लैयात् etc. does not immediately follow. Instead, what we have there in the *Mbh.* is the enunciation of the third view : ... द्वयोरपि, बहूनामपि which is like a wedge in the two parts of the refutation. So Bhar. points out where properly the passage : यदप्युच्यते — 'इह च निर्ग्लैयात् ... etc. is to be read. Similarly Kaiy. : यदप्युच्यत इति। पाठक्रमादर्थक्रमो बलीयानिति 'मस्जेरन्त्यात् पूर्वम्' इत्यस्यानन्तरमिदं द्रष्टव्यम्।

(*p.* 22, *l.* 1) किं पुनरयं बहूनामेव ... etc. The *Dīp.* asks the question whether this is a refutation of the objections raised against बहूनामेव (i. e. समुदायस्य) संयोगसंज्ञा (on which view it has been suggested above that the passage should be removed to a suitable place) or whether it is a refutation of the immediately preceding view, viz. अविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञा (in which case the *Dīp.* apparently suggests that it could remain where it is). Since the latter view (in two versions) is assigned to अन्ये and अपरे, Bhar. obviously favours the former view (एकस्तावत् परिहारः[1], बहूनामेवाभ्युपगम्यायं परिहार इति).

तत् कथमिव समुदाये ··· etc. The result of the discussion yet to follow is anticipated here. When the whole is unable to earn the name (as will be shown below), there is nothing to prevent the name from applying to parts (like *-gl-* in *nirgleyāt*), it is claimed.

(*p.* 22, *l.* 3) समुदायश्चैजिति ... etc. The *Dīp.* says that a whole can be mentioned in two ways, either by enumerating all the constituents or by mentioning them by some abbreviated way (the *pratyāhāra*). The phonemes *e, o, ai* and *au*, e. g. can be mentioned by enumerating them all (as in the Akṣarasamāmnāya) or by the abbreviated name *ec* (as e. g. in P. 6. 1. 78). In P. 1. 1. 7 which defines a *saṁyoga*, the consonants are mentioned neither in the form of enumeration nor of abbreviation (which both are obviously impossible); they are अनवधारिताः as the *Dīp.* says. So there cannot be any insistence intended by Pāṇini on the totality of consecutive consonants (three, four etc.) in a word as the recipient of the name *saṁyoga*. On the other hand, a name is meant for facilitating an operation. When a cluster of, say, three consonants. cannot get the name because of the qualification *aṅgasya*, as e. g. in *nirgleyāt* where only *-gl-* belong to the *aṅga* (not the whole *-rgl-*), our purpose is not served. So, obviously, a close contact of three consonants (त्रिव्यञ्जनविषयमानन्तर्यम्) is not there insisted on. When this condition is thus loosened, the remaining two consonants, since they fulfil the condition of *ānantarya*, can get the name *saṁyoga* without anything coming in their way.

Bhar.'s idea becomes clear when we read Kaiy. which is as follows : निर्ग्लेयादित्यादिषु यद्यपि त्रयो हलः संनिहितास्तथापि कार्यार्थत्वात्संज्ञायाः, त्रिषु च कार्याभावाद्, अङ्गपदधात्ववयवसंयोगस्य तेषु लक्षणेष्वाश्रितत्वात्, समुदाये कार्याभावे चावयवानां स्वकार्यारम्भाद् द्वयोरेव संज्ञा प्रवर्तत इत्यर्थः। व्याख्यानान्तरमत्र क्लिष्टत्वान्नोक्तम्।

अन्ये वर्णयन्ति ... etc. (1) The *Dīp.* tells us that according to 'others' the whole *Mbh.* here (यदप्युच्यते ... विशेषयिष्यामः) is merely the other view (परपक्ष

1. This word परिहारः is rather strange here. Apparently पक्षः or पर्यायः was expected.

=पूर्वपक्ष) quoted once more. The implication is that the Siddhānta is not given here.

(2) Where is it then ? Bhar. does not give the reply directly. By his action he conveys that we have to supply it. The *Dīp.* : एतदसत् । कुत: ? यस्मादविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञा द्वयोश्च बहूनां चेति is the Siddhānta supplied by Bhar.

(3) The *parapakṣa* as it has appeared before in the *Dīp.* (*p.* 20, *l.* 1) reads thus : ' इह च निर्ग्लैयात् निर्ग्लायात् ... इत्येत्वं न प्राप्नोति । योऽत्र संयोगो नासावङ्गस्य कश्चिदपि, यश्चाङ्गस्य नासौ संयोग इति । In this original passage the qualification of *saṁyoga* by *aṅga* is meant to be the reason why the name is not available in निर्ग्लेयात् etc. on the समुदाये संज्ञा view. In its repetition here, however, the relevant sentence, viz. अङ्गेन संयोगादि विशेषयिष्याम: has obviously the opposite purpose : it is meant to show how the name could be made available by this qualification. Since this is not palatable to the sponsors of this interpretation they have to show, by hook or by crook, that here also the expression serves the same purpose as its older occurrence. Bhar. does not say how this is done. Nāg., however, tells us that for this purpose इति has to be taken in the sense of यस्मात् and it is to be connected[1] with what follows (not with what precedes), for which see below.

(4) The whole *parapakṣa*, which is thus reconstructed by means of a reinterpretation of the present passage by these *anye*, is now furnished by them with a *siddhānta*, as said above, which they have invented : तदसत् । यस्मादविशेषेण ... etc. Here the third view : अविशेषेण संयोगसंज्ञा, द्वयोरपि बहूनामपि comes in. The opponent's view is wrong (तदसत् ।). For, *-gl-* is a part of the *aṅga*, characterized by close contact. So by the option provided by द्वयोरपि, it can have the name *saṁyoga*.

(5) This kind of strained and complicated (*kliṣṭa*) interpretation is obviously adopted to justify the sequence of the *Mbh.* passages. In the first interpretation given in the *Dīp.* it is taken for granted that the present passage is directly connected with the *Mbh.* under the *Vār.* समुदाये ... मस्जे:, as replying the objections raised therein. The defence there was अङ्गेन संयोगादि विशेषयिष्याम:. In the second interpretation, अङ्गेन संयोगादिं विशेषयिष्याम: is the drawback and the third view : द्वयोरपि बहूनामपि is the defence. Since that view is to be the defence, it has been placed before the present passage. There is no misplacement of the *Mbh.* passages according to this view.

(6) Kaiy., as we saw above, does not give this alternative interpretation saying : व्याख्यानान्तरमत्र क्लिष्टत्वान्नोक्तम्. And it *is* a *kliṣṭa* interpretation, what

1. यस्मादङ्गेन संयोगादिर्विशेष्यते, तस्मात् संयोगसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति ।

with assigning an unusual meaning and imposing strange grammatical constructions on the text which is otherwise simple, just to defend somehow the existing order of passages in the *Mbh.* Luckily, however, Nāg. has given in detail this interpretation also, although Kaiy., on whom he comments, thought it better to ignore it. Read the *Uddy.*: व्याख्यानान्तरमिति। पाठक्रमाबाधायैवं व्याचक्षते — 'न प्राप्नोति' इत्यत्रेतिशब्दो यस्मादर्थ उत्तरान्वयी। यस्मादङ्गेन संयोगादिर्विशेष्यतेऽङ्गावयवः संयोगो गृह्यते इत्यर्थः। एवं च बहूनामेव संयोगत्वे यः संयोगः नासावङ्गावयवः, यश्चाङ्गावयवो नासौ संयोगस्तस्मादेत्वं न प्राप्नोतीति यदपि [उच्यते], तदप्यसत्। यतोऽविशेषेण संज्ञोच्यते इति शेष इति। तत् क्लिष्टम्, शेषपूरणात्, इतेः स्वरसतो वाक्यसमाप्त्यर्थतायाः प्रतीयमानत्वाच्च। 'एवं तावत् सर्वमाङ्गं परिहृतम्' इत्यस्यास्वारस्याच्च।

(7) If we read Nāg.'s *Uddy.* carefully, we will not fail to see that he has practically taken the whole argument and even the phraseology (particularly the *śeṣapūraṇa* : तदसत्। ... etc.) from the *Dīp.* Since this interpretation is not there in the *Prad.*, the fact assumes great importance from the point of view of the history of the *Dīp.* For, this shows that *Dīp.* was there before Nāg. when he wrote his *Uddy.*

अपरे वर्णयन्ति .. etc. This explanation also depends on the third view : द्वयोरपि बहूनामपि. It does not, however, resort to any *kliṣṭavyākhyāna.* Here what was regarded as a reason why the name *saṁyoga* is not available to *-gl-* (in *nirgleyāt*), viz. the qualification of *saṁyoga* by *aṅga*, that itself is regarded as a reason why *-gl-* should be called a *saṁyoga*. The opponent's view was that only the whole (*-rgl-*) can be called a *saṁyoga*, but of this group *r* does not belong to *aṅga*. Now the Siddhāntin argues that the third view द्वयोरपि ... grants the name *saṁyoga* to *-gl-* (which also are a part of the *aṅga*). So what was a weapon in the hands of the Pūrvapakṣin becomes a weapon in the hands of the Siddhāntin.

In the first interpretation the difficulty was waved off on the ground that view बहूनामेव has no practical utility : no *aṅga* begins with more-than-two vowels. In the other explanations the direct sanction द्वयोरपि ... (the third view) is invoked.

[5]

स्वरानन्तर्हिता हलः ... etc. This is the last topic discussed by Kāt. and Pat. under P. 1. 1. 7. The *Mbh.* runs thus : 'स्वरानन्तर्हितवचनम् (वा. ५)। स्वरैरनन्तर्हिता हलः संयोगसंज्ञा भवन्तीति वक्तव्यम्। किं प्रयोजनम्? व्यवहितानां मा भूत्। पचति पनसम्।

Kāt. here introduces for discussion a suggestion that a qualification स्वरैरनन्तर्हिताः 'not intervened by vowels' be introduced for consonants to which is to be given the name *saṁyoga*. Otherwise, even consonants intervened by vowels

will get the name *saṁyoga* which will result into some undesired forms, e. g. in पचति पनसम् (example furnished by Pat.).

पचतीति रूपोदाहरणम् ... etc. The *Dīp.* makes a distinction between the two examples. In the first example (*pacati*), the three consonants *p...c...t* will undesiredly get the name *saṁyoga* while in the second (*panasam*), the name will be similarly due for *p...n...s...m*. Now the difference between the two examples is this: Even if *p...c...t* get the name *saṁyoga*, it does not matter. No further undesired operation is going to result out of it. (So let it have the name.) The name here is only in form (रूपोदाहरणम्). The other example, however, is of a different kind. If *p...n...s...m* get the name *saṁyoga*, the penultimate *s* will be *saṁyogādi* and will have to be dropped by P. 8. 2. 29: स्कोः संयोगाद्योः .... So the *Dīp.* calls this a कार्योदाहरणम्.

Observation: This distinction introduced by Bhar. viz. रूपोदाहरणम् and कार्यो° is not found in the *Kāś*. But its comm. the *Padam.* picks it up. Only it improves on it by using प्रत्युदाहरणम् instead of mere उदा°. Read the *Kāś.* and the *Padam.*: (काशिका) अनन्तरा इति किम्? पचति पनसम्। 'स्कोः संयोगाद्योः ...' इति लोपः स्यात्। On this the *Padam.*: पचतीति रूपप्रत्युदाहरणम्। पनसमिति कार्यप्रत्युदाहरणम्। 'स्कोः संयोगाद्योरिति लोपः स्याद्' इति। यदि सकारमकारयोः सान्तरयोरपि संयोगसंज्ञा स्यादिति भावः।

(*p.* 22, *l.* 16) केचिन्मन्यन्ते ... etc. The *Dīp.* mentions a difference of opinion as regards how to understand the example पचति पनसम्. It seems that while some regarded that पचति and पनसम् are two different examples, unconnected with each other, the others understood the two words as forming one grammatical sentence, पचति and पनसम् being related mutually by some Kāraka relation (the sentence meaning something like 'the jack fruit ripens').

The word प्रपाठ (Sw अपाठ) does not occur elsewhere. It seems to mean a mere collection of words, a list etc. Here it contrasts with a grammatical sentence where words are syntactically and semantically connected with one another.

For a similar example, which could be doubtful whether a *prapāṭha* or a *vākya* is meant, cf. the three words पशुं विद्धं पचन्ति (*Mbh.* I. 23. 7).

[5. 1]

(*p.* 22, *l.* 19) अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामाविति ... etc. This example comes in the course of an objection against the above suggestion. The objector says that the suggestion (of reading स्वरैरनन्तर्हिताः) is unnecessary. The desired object is already achieved by the word अनन्तराः (which evidently includes स्वरैरनन्तर्हिताः also) read by Pāṇini in the Sū. This argument is thus rejected in the *Mbh.*;

'दृष्टमानन्तर्यं व्यवहितेऽपि' (वा. ६)। व्यवहितेऽप्यनन्तरशब्दो दृश्यते। तद् यथा — 'अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ' इत्युच्यते, तयोश्चैवान्तरा नद्यश्च पर्वताश्च भवन्ति।

It is argued here that the word *anantara* is not sufficient for our purpose, for it does not rule out intervention. It is seen that the word *anantara* is used even with reference to those objects which are separated by some intervening object. For example, we use the word *anantara* with reference to two villages which are adjacent to each other, even when they are separated by rivers or hills. On this parallel the name *saṁyoga* will apply to consonants even when they are separated by vowels. So स्वरैरनन्तर्हिता: must be added (एवमपि ... इति कर्तव्यं स्वरान्तर्हितलक्षणम्).

(*p.* 22, *l.* 21) अनन्तरवचनमिदानीं ... etc. A protest in righteous indignation by the opponent of the suggestion. If the word *anantara* 'not intervened, not separated' cannot include the meaning 'not intervened by vowels' what earthly purpose could that serve? The *Dīp.* एषोऽभिप्राय:। हलावन° clarifies this question. The passage, which is not wholly clear, seems to say: you think that the word *anantara* does not guarantee absence of intervention between two objects. Arguing further, you could say that the possibitity of more-than-two objects being called *anantara* inspite of intervention is also there. The result is neither two nor more-than-two consonants could be called a *saṁyoga*. If *anantara* in the Sū. cannot prevent two or more-than-two consonants separated by vowels from being named a *saṁyoga*, what consonants are then excluded by the term *anantara*? Why does Pāṇini use it?

[5. 1. 1]

(*p.* 22, *l.* 24) किमर्थमनन्तरवचनमिति चेत् — etc. एकप्रतिषेधार्थम् (=एकस्य हल: संयोगसंज्ञा मा भूदिति) is the most surprising answer given by Kāt. to the above question. When, however, *saṁyoga* is not to be taken as an etymologically significant expression, but an artificial name, there is nothing illogical in the reply. The *Mbh.* here runs as: 'आनन्तर्यवचनं किमर्थमिति चेदेकप्रतिषेधार्थम्' (वा. ७)। एकस्य हल: संयोगसंज्ञा मा भूदिति। किं च स्याद् यद्येकस्य हल: संयोगसंज्ञा स्यात्? इयेष, उवोष 'इजादेश्च गुरुमतोऽनृच्छ:' इत्याम् प्रसज्येत।

(*p.* 22, *l.* 24) अनन्तरवचनेन विषय: ... etc. The *Mbh.* does not explain the significance of the word *anantara* as meant by Kāt., so the *Dīp.* does it. It is true that by normal word power *anantara* cannot prohibit the name *saṁyoga* in the case of a single consonant. But it can do so by implication, by stating the domain (विषय:) of the term. Since the expression can naturally refer to two or more objects, from a single consonant the name *saṁyoga* is automatically ruled out (पर्युदस्त:). Cf. Kaiy.: न चैकाकिन्यनन्तरव्यवहार इति भाव:।

इयेषेति । आम् प्रसज्येत. The purpose (एकप्रतिषेधार्थम्) is here illustrated. In इयेष (इष्+लिट्), if ṣ were to get the name *saṁyoga*, then the preceding *i* will be called *guru* (P. 1. 4. 11 : संयोगे गुरु), so that finally, instead of इयेष, the *liṭ* form will be the one with *ām* (*एषांचकार or some such thing) by P. 3. 1. 36 : इजादेश्च ....

But then a question arises : गुरुमद्वचनमिदानीं किमर्थं स्यात्? If Pāṇini had intended even single consonants to be called a *saṁyoga*, why should he use the word *gurumat* in this rule? The object in putting this word is to exclude *ām* in the case of those *ijādi* roots which do not have a *guru* vowel. But with even single consonants having the name *saṁyoga* every initial *ic* vowel (i. e. a vowel other than ă) will be *guru*. What root is then excluded by the specific use of the word *gurumat*? (And if there is no case to be excluded, the explanation अनन्तरवचनम् एकप्रतिषेधार्थम् loses all force.)

शुद्ध इजादिः इण् ... etc. gives the reply to this question. The expression *gurumat* retains its scope (even on अनन्तरवचनम् एकप्रतिषेधार्थम् view) in the case of roots which consist merely of vowels, i. e. where no consonant follows. The root *i* 'to go' (इण् गतौ, P. Dh. II, 36) is a case in point. Now *i* is *ic*; it is also *ijādi* (of course by व्यपदेशिवद्भाव). *Ām* would have forced itself in the *liṭ* form (*iyāya*) if *gurumat* had not been there in the rule.

Readings : (1) (*p.* 22, *l.* 13) Ed, स्वरैरनन्तर्हिताः. Ed. वक्तव्यम् (for पठितव्यम्). — (2) (*p.* 22, *l.* 16) Sw अपाठो (for प्र°). — (3) (*p.* 22, *l.* 17) MSAL यावत् संयोगसं(AL °गः सं)योग°. — (4) (*p.* 22, *l.* 20) MS अंतरव्य°. — (5) (*p.* 22, *l.* 20) MS Sw लभते. — (6) MS अंतरत्वम्. — (7) (*p.* 22, *l.* 21) Ed. आनन्तर्य- (for अनन्तर-). — (8) (*p.* 22, *l.* 23) AL Sw तत्र (for तत्र). — (9) (*p.* 22, *l.* 24) Ed. आनन्तर्यवचनं किमर्थमिति चेदेक°. In this section the *Dīp.* is not very careful in quoting the *Mbh.* — (10) (*p.* 22, *l.* 27) MS प्रयुज्यत; AL सज्येत. — (11) (*p.* 22, *l.* 27) MS Sw इदा...यः; AL यः. After इदा the MS leaves blank space for two letters (followed faithfully by Sw). AL ignore both इदा and also the following blank space. We reconstruct इदानीं which hardly requires any justification. Further, taking into consideration the special significance of इदानीम् in asking such a question, we also supply किमर्थं स्यात् as the part of the question, which would otherwise be — unreasonably — a part of the reply. Cf. the much similar अनन्तरवचनमिदानीं किमर्थं स्यात् above (*l.* 21).

[5. 2]

न वातज्जातीयव्यवायात् (वा. ८). This is the last *Vār.* It rejects the suggestion which was made in *Vār.* 5 and supported in 6 and 7. The Bhāṣya on this *Vār.* runs as : न वैष दोषः। किं कारणम्? अतज्जातीयस्य व्यवायात्। अतज्जातीयं हि लोके व्यवधायकं भवति। Vowels are heterogeneous (अतज्जातीय, भिन्नजातीय) with

reference to consonants. So, in *panasam* (the case under discussion), there is an intervention of vowels between *p...n*, *n...s* etc. Since there is intervention, the consonants cannot be called *anantara*. Since they are not *anantara*, they cannot be called *saṁyoga*. (And since there is no name *saṁyoga* here, there is no danger of *s* being required to be dropped.) Finally, as the name *saṁyoga* does not become due at all — because of the expression *anantara* in the Sū. — the suggestion स्वरानन्तर्हितवचनम् is superfluous.

(*p.* 23, *l.* 2) एवं हि कंचित् कश्चित् etc. The full text of the *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* is as follows : कथं पुनर्ज्ञायते, अतज्जातीयकं लोके व्यवधायकं भवतीति। एवं हि कंचित् कश्चित् पृच्छति — अनन्तरे एते ब्राह्मणकुले ? इति। स आह — नानन्तरे। वृषलकुलमनयोरन्तरेति।

वृषलकुलमिति। अत्र चोद्यते ... etc. The opponent raises an objection. What is the point, he asks, in saying अतज्जातीयकं व्यवधायकं भवति ? One can equally say : तुल्यजातीयं व्यवधायकं भवति. An intervening house of a Brāhmaṇa does separate the two Brāhmaṇa houses on its both sides. — True, he is told. The only point in giving this parallel is to point out the defect in his stand. Earlier he gave the example of अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ and said that the heterogeneous objects do not seem to be regarded as an intervention, since in spite of the intervening river etc. the two villages are called *anantarau*. No. He was wrong there. Every intervening object, heterogeneous or homogeneous, does cause intervention.

So vowels too do cause an intervention. Therefore the word *anantarāḥ* in the Sū. takes care to see that there is no name *saṁyoga* in *panasam* etc. (अतो लोकवदिहापि स्वरव्यवहितानां नास्ति संयोगसंज्ञा।). The suggestion स्वरानन्तर्हितवचनम् is unnecessary.

(*p.* 23, *l.* 6) हल्व्यवधानेऽपि नास्ति ... etc. An expanding on तुल्यजातीयं परं व्यवधायकं भवति. (*l.* 4). In the word *uṣṭra*, e. g., *ṣ–r* are not called a *saṁyoga* (because of the intervention of *ṭ*, although it is homogeneous, in that it is a consonant); *-ṣṭ-* and *-ṭr-*, however are called a *saṁyoga*. Similarly, the whole cluster *-ṣṭr-* also is a *saṁyoga*, because there is no intervention (अव्यवधानात् [*l.* 7], our emendation for व्यव° of the MS and the eds.). We also put a *daṇḍa* after टकारेण व्यवधानात् as required by consideration of meaning.

(*p.* 23, *l.* 9) किं पुनः कारणमिति. This is a part of the following *Mbh.* : किं पुनः कारणं क्वचिदतज्जातीयं व्यवधायकं भवति, क्वचिन्न ? Here the first *kvacit* = वृषलकुलेन व्यवहितयोर्ब्राह्मणकुलयोः, the second = नद्यादिभिर्व्यवहितयोर्ग्रामयोः.

As the *Dīp.* explains, व्यवधायकं भवति in the *Mbh.* really means व्यवहिते ऽनन्तरशब्दो न प्रवर्तते and व्यवधायकं न भवति similarly means व्यवहितेऽपि अनन्तरशब्दः प्रवर्तते. Incidentally, we emend the MS यस्तथा (evidently corrupt) to ह्युभयथा to suit the intended sense.

(*p.* 23, *l.* 11) इतर एकान्तेनैव ... etc. This is an introduction to the *Mbh.* (quoted in the *Dīp.*) : सर्वत्रैव ह्यतज्जातीयकं व्यवधायकं भवति, which is the reply to the question : किं पुनः कारणं क्वचिद् ... क्वचिन्न. The usage[1] of the word *anantara* is seen to be in two ways (उभयथा). Sometimes it covers objects which are intervened by a heterogeneous object; sometimes it does not apply to them. What is the logical reason (उपपत्तिः) belind this? The reply to this question is : सर्वत्रैव ह्यतज्जातीयकं ... etc. Immediately comes the question in the *Mbh.* : If so, how do you say अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ inspite of the intervening objects like rivers?

The reply in the *Mbh.* is as follows : ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थः। अस्त्येव शालासमुदाये वर्तते — तद्यथा, ग्रामो दग्ध इति। अस्ति वाटपरिक्षेपे वर्तते — तद्यथा, ग्रामं प्रविष्ट इति। अस्ति मनुष्येषु वर्तते — तद्यथा, ग्रामो गतो ग्राम आगत इति। अस्ति सारण्यके, ससीमके, सस्थण्डिलके वर्तते — तद्यथा, ग्रामो लब्ध इति। तद्यः सारण्यके, ससीमके, सस्थण्डिलके वर्तते, तमभिसमीक्ष्यैतत् प्रयुज्यते — अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामाविति। सर्वत्रैव ह्यतज्जातीयकं व्यवधायकं भवति।

(*p.* 23, *l.* 12) एतदाचष्टे — अनन्तरशब्दोऽविकल्पार्थः etc. The *Dīp.* gives here in a nutshell the secret behind the use of the word *anantara* in अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ, in spite of the two villages being apparently separated by river etc. — particularly in view of the *Mbh.* statement made just now : सर्वत्रैव ह्यतज्जातीयकं व्यवधानं भवति. It is not, says the *Dīp.*, that the word *anantara* changes its meaning; it is the word *grāma* which does it (अनन्तरशब्दोऽत्राविकल्पार्थः। ग्रामशब्दस्तु विकल्पितार्थः।). You object to the use of *anantara* here because you understand the word *grāma* in a particular way. If you understand it in the correct way, all contradiction ceases.

The *Mbh.* has listed a number of meanings which are denoted by the word *grāma* in different contexts. Finally it specifies the meaning which is understood in the context of अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ. This meaning happens to be the widest one, including in itself not only people and their houses, but also the surrounding wall, the river flowing through, the hills and forests on the outskirts of the villages and so on. When these objects also are regarded as a part of the villages, they cease to be अतज्जातीय. There is then no intervention by something heterogeneous. When the outermost forest of one village touches the outermost forest of the other, we can well say : अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ. Hence the *Dīp.* (*p.* 23, *l.* 23 : ... इति नद्या अप्यन्तर्भावादनन्तरावेतौ न व्यवहितौ).

Hence the conclusion : नैवं व्यवहिते अनन्तरशब्दो वर्तते.

---

1. In the place of the *Dīp.* reading प्रतिपत्तिः, प्रवृत्तिः would have been no doubt better (in *l.* 9).

[5. 3]

(*p*. 23, *l*. 15) तत्र बह्वर्थतायां विप्रतिपत्तिः ... etc. The *Mbh*. here says ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थः. This leads Bhar. into a discussion of the difference of opinion (विप्रतिपत्तिः) about the way this plurality of meanings is accounted for. (1) According to one view (केचिन्मन्यन्ते), though outwardly the same (e. g. *grāma* in the many sentences), the words (since they convey different meanings) have to be regarded as different. (अर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदः, as it is said elsewhere.) It is merely similarity of the phonetic form that leads one to take them as one (सारूप्यात् तत्त्वाध्यवसायः). (2) Others, however, (apparently giving more importance to the common phonetic form) regard the word as one in all these sentences. They attribute the denotation of different meanings to different expressive powers which are believed to be possessed by a word. One power is operative in one context, another in another (तस्य त्वर्थवशात् क्वचिदेव शक्तिः कस्मिंश्चिदेव वाक्य आश्रीयत इति ।).

(*p*. 23, *l*. 18) यथा तु भाष्यं तथा ... etc. The *Dīp*. suggests Pat.'s preference with regard to these two views. Bhar. thinks that ' as many meanings, so many words ' seems to be favoured by the *Mbh*. (शब्दा एव प्रविभक्ता इति लक्ष्यन्ते). He deduces this inference from the way the *Mbh*. concludes the argument (एवं हि निगमनम्) viz. तद्यः सारण्यके ससीमके...etc. The wording यः (ग्रामशब्दः) सारण्यके ... वर्तते etc. shows that Pat. regards ' this ' *grāma* different from other *grāma* words having other meanings.

शक्तिप्रविभागाभ्युपगमे हि एवं वक्तव्यम्. Though this *Dīp*. looks very simple, there are some difficulties. Firstly, a minor point about the reading is to be settled. The MS actually reads शक्तिप्रविभक्तिभागात्भ्युप° etc. Both प्रविभक्ति and (प्रवि)भाग mean one and the same thing. So only one of the two could be original. Taking tentatively भक्ति as some sort of scribal repetition for शक्ति, we decide on शक्तिप्रविभाग. Secondly, if there is to be a compound, the Abl. भागात् is incorrect. So we finally read शक्तिप्रविभागाभ्युप°.

But now the difficulty is : Why does he use *hi* instead of *tu* which would have been proper ? So we somehow take *hi*=*tu* which is normal for indicating a *pakṣavyāvṛtti*. The important expression here is तद्यदा. Bhar. says that if Pat. had favoured एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थकः view, he would have read तद्यदा instead of तद्यः (i. e. तद्यदा सारण्यके ससीमके etc. instead of तद्यः सारण्यके ससीमके etc.) For, तद्यः implies one out of many while तद्यदा implies one and the same in a particular capacity.

Although the MS clearly reads तद्यदेति, Sw emends it to तद्यथेति under the mistaken motion that it is a *Mbh*. *pratīka*. He was tempted to do so obviously by the expression तद्यथा which occurs four times in this passage. But after the above discussion it should be obvious that here तद्यदा is an original part of the

Dīp., meant to spell out its एवम्, and not a *pratīka* of the *Mbh.* to be further emended to तद्यदा.

Observation : Bhar. merely states the two views and observes that Pat. seems to favour the शब्दा एव प्रविभक्ताः (i. e. अर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदः) view, if one is to go by his expression तद्यः (ग्रामशब्दः) सारण्यके etc. He does not expressly say that there is contradiction between the *Mbh.* ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थः on the one hand and तद्यः (ग्रामशब्दः) सारण्यके on the other. The other commentators, however, do say that there is a contradiction. Cf. Nāg. : 'ग्रामशब्दोऽयम्' इत्यस्य 'तद्यः सारण्यके इत्यस्य चाविरोधायाह (on Kaiy.; केचिदर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदमिच्छन्ति etc.) and the *Chāyā* on it : अन्यथोपक्रम एकत्वस्य, उपसंहारे भेदस्य ग्रामशब्दस्य प्रतीतेर्विरोधः स्पष्ट एव. They therefore maintain that on the एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थः view, the *Mbh.* तद्यः (ग्रामशब्दः) सारण्यके is to be regarded as figurative (उपचरित), based on the plurality of expressive power (*śakti*), while on the अर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदः view the expression ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थः is figurative, based on the common (सामान्य) phonetic form.

[5. 4]

(*p.* 23, *l.* 25) अथ यदा ग्रामोऽस्तीति ... etc. Bhar. here raises a question (not pursued further by Kaiy. etc.). When a general statement like ग्रामोऽस्ति 'There is a village' is made, does the word *grāma* convey separately all the constituents (like men, houses etc.) of its meaning? The reply is given in the negative, the reason for it being given in सारण्यके ह्यन्तर्भाविताः ... etc. which is obviously meant to be a parallel. When one says, ग्रामो लब्धः, the word *grāma* is understood in the widest meaning, from men etc. within the village up to forests etc, on the outskirts (and may be even beyond). The whole panorama is grasped in a single flash so to say, not one after another separately. The same thing happens in the case of ग्रामोऽस्ति. If one insists on a series of separate cognitions in the case of ग्रामोऽस्ति, one will have to accept it in the case of ग्रामो लब्धः (where ग्रामशब्दः सारण्यके ... वर्तते), which is evidently not desirable.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 1) स तु कदाचित् प्रतिपत्त्रा न विगृह्यते. There is no *na* in this sentence in the MS. However, as the following *Dīp.* (एतावत्तु प्रतिपद्यते ... and अतश्च न प्रतिपद्यते) shows, it is necessary, otherwise what follows will have no meaning. But if we accordingly insert a *na* in this sentence, it will create another difficulty. The previous sentence (तस्मात् सर्वे एव शब्दाः कस्मिंश्चिद्विशेषे प्रयुज्यन्ते) says that all words are used in some particular sense. Evidently, it (*viśeṣaḥ*) is supposed to be understood by the listner. If we now say : 'It is not understood by the listner' (स तु प्रतिपत्त्रा न विगृह्यते) this will be very strange. It should be axiomatic that the particular meaning is usually understood, but sometimes it may not be understood. The *Dīp.* एतावत्तु प्रतिपद्यते ... etc. must be taken to refer to this latter possibility. So along with न we also supply a word कदाचित् (*l.* 1). —यत्र (*l.* 3) is

rather in the sense of यतः. Or, though syntactically defective, it may be taken in the sense of '(particularly) where.'

[5. 5]

(*p.* 24, *l.* 4) केषांचित् त्वत्रेदं दर्शनम् ... etc. Here Bhar. mentions a view about the meaning of the word *grāma* according to which 'the surrounding wall' is the main meaning and others the secondary ones. The residents, for example, are called *grāma* (in ग्रामो गतः etc.), secondarily, because they dwell in it (तात्स्थ्यात्) or for some such reason. Since the residents form a secondary meaning, the names of villages do not change even when people from one village shift to another and vice versa.

In *ll.* 7 ff. (तेषां तु कर्मनिमित्तमिदं दर्शनम् ... etc.) the *Dīp.* gives a reason why these people regard the surrounding wall of the village (वाटपरिक्षेपः) as the principal meaning. The view is based on the role the *grāma* plays in connection with activity, i. e. religious activity. The *grāma* is prohibited for certain acts, e. g. for reciting some sacred texts, or for entering. In practice it is the surrounding wall within which there is to be no recitation, or within which a Saṁnyāsin shall not enter. Hence the contention : वाटपरिक्षेपे ऽस्य (=ग्रामशब्दस्य) मुख्या वृत्तिः.

The *Dīp.* mentions three injunctions in this connection. They are :

1. ग्रामे नाध्येयम् ।

2. ग्रामं च न प्रविशेत् ।

3. न भुक्त्वा न ग्रामे शुक्रियं चेति ।

With the first one, cf. प्राग् वोदग् वा ग्रामान्निष्क्रम्य ... अधीयीत स्वाध्यायम् is *Āśv-Gṛ-Sū.* 3. 2. 2. The second is found exactly in this form at *Gaut-Dharma-Sū.* 3. 33. The third consists of two Sūtras (1. 4. 13-14) from the *Mānava-Gṛ-Sū.* They run as follows : रुद्रांश्च नक्तं न भुक्त्वा न ग्रामे (13) शुक्रियस्य प्रवर्ग्यकल्पे नियमो व्याख्यातः ... etc. They lay down rules about the recitation of the *Rudrādhyāya* and the *Śukriya* Sāmans. It will be seen that while Bhar. quotes as शुक्रियं, the word in the original is शुक्रियस्य and grammatically it forms a part of the next sentence which is a different Sūtra. It seems that the *Mānava-Gṛ-Sū.* quoted here has not been transmitted correctly in the *Dīp.* MS.

[5. 6]

(*p.* 24, *l.* 12) अपर एवं मन्यते etc. Yet another view regarding what is the principal meaning of the word *grāma*. According to this view, the meaning which the word has in अनन्तराविमौ ग्रामौ, the meaning which is the widest as it includes even forests etc. on the outskirts (सारण्यके ससीमके ... etc.), that is the principal meaning. It is thus a समुदायशब्द. If it also sometimes denotes only

people (living in the village) it is a secondary denotation. (The MS श्रुत्वा [or °त्या] is corrupt. We take it to be वृत्त्या. Further, for the sake of an exact statement, we add a word गौण्या. We do not claim that this latter word was necessarily in the MS originally.) It is like other words which, originally expressive of a conglomeration of meanings, then come secondarily to denote part-meanings also, as e. g. the word Pañcāla in पूर्वे पञ्चालाः (the Eastern Pañcala; here the word Pañcāla, as qualified by *pūrva*, denotes only a part of the larger country which it denoted previously.)

The *Dīp.* समुदायशब्दस्तु ... पूर्वे पञ्चालाः is based on such *Mbh.* passages as समुदायेषु हि शब्दाः प्रवृत्ता अवयवेष्वपि वर्तन्ते। तद्यथा, पूर्वे पञ्चालाः, उत्तरे पञ्चालाः, तैलं भुक्तम्, घृतं भुक्तम्, शुक्लो नीलः कृष्ण इति (I. 12. 18–20).

(*p.* 24, *l.* 15) अस्मिन् दर्शने ... etc. The *Dīp.* remarks that on this view the *Mbh.* ग्रामशब्दोऽयं बह्वर्थः (or, stated in general, एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थः) cannot be taken as the final view (निगमितम्) of the *Mbh.* in this matter. For, on this view, a word has only one meaning, i. e. only one principal meaning. (There could be many subordinate, secondary or figurative meanings, but this is a different thing.) Incidentally, we emend the MS नगमितं to न [नि]गमितं.

अतोऽस्यैतद् दर्शनम् (*l.* 16). अतः=since the view एकः शब्दो बह्वर्थः is not finally accepted. अस्य=(probably) भाष्यकारस्य, unless Bhar. is referring to *aparaḥ* (who holds : सारण्यके ... मुख्या वृत्तिः). The word *grāma* meaning, say, 'people living in a village' has nothing to do with the word *grāma* which means 'a surrounding wall'. Bhar. gives a parallel. The two *grāma* words are as distinct from each other as (1) the nominal form (Nom. sing.) *aśvaḥ* which means 'a horse' and (2) the verbal form *aśvaḥ* (Aor. 2. sing. Parasmai fr. *śvi* 'to swell'). The two words simply convey their own respective meanings (स्वार्थे प्रवर्तेते) without helping in any way each other to convey its meaning (इतरेतरमनुपकारि).

जातिमत्यर्थे — 'a particular kind (of animal)' is the *svārtha* of *aśvaḥ* No. 1. while a *kriyā* (viz. swelling) along with its *sādhana* (=*kartṛ* here) viz. 2ng. sing in the *svārtha* of $\sqrt{}$*aśvaḥ* No. 2.

Readings: (1) (*p.* 23, *l.* 2) MSSw लोके तेस्य दिग (for लोकतोऽस्य) — (2) (*p.* 23, *l.* 3) MS reads वृषकं(? °ल)कुल after ननु च. — (3) (*p.* 23, *l.* 4) MS °जातीयसंतयोर्; AL °यसंयोग-; Sw °ययोर् (for °यकं तयोर्). — (4) (*p.* 23, *l.* 9) MS Sw यस्तथानन्तर-; AL या तस्यान° (for ह्युभयथान°). — (5) (*p.* 23, *l.* 11) Ed. सर्वत्रैव ह्यतज्जातीयकं व्यव ... and (6) ऽयं बह्वर्थः. — (7) (*p.* 23, *l.* 12) AL [अ]विकल्पार्थः (for °ल्पितार्थः). — (8) (*p.* 23, *l.* 13) MS ALSw प्रयोगे. — (9) (*p.* 23, *l.* 19) MS शक्तिप्रविभक्तिभागात् भ्युपगमे; AL °भावाभ्युपगमे. — (10) (*p.* 23, *l.* 22) MS °क्षेय एवां; Sw °क्षेप एव. — (11) (*p.* 23, *l.* 27) Sw ins (न) after पुरुषादयः. — (12) (*p.* 24, *l.* 3) AL Sw प्रतिपत्स्यते. — (13) (*p.* 24, *l.* 12) AL सस्थण्डिलके

— (14) (*p.* 24, *l.* 13) MSSw श्रुत्वावयवेषु; AL श्रुत्याऽव°. — (15) (*p.* 24, *l.* 16) Sw वात्यन्तम्.

* * *

P. 1. 1. 8 : *mukhanāsikāvacano 'nunāsikaḥ*

The following three topics are discussed in the *Mbh.* under this Sū. : (1) How to defend the form °*nāsikā*° (where apparently °*nāsika*° was expected) ? (2) Whether the word *mukha-* can be dispensed with. (3) The alleged defect of *iteretarāśraya* involved in the definition.

[1]

किमिदं मुखनासिकावचन इति. The question is asked, as the *Dīp.* explains, because the form °नासिका° ill suits the intended meaning (यथार्थं शब्दः ... उच्यते). This is the reason : The compound is evidently intended to be dissolved as : मुखं च नासिका च वचनं यस्य. Here मुखं and नासिका being parts of the body, their Dvandva compound has to be a *samāhāra* (i. e. singular) (P. 2. 4. 2 : द्वंद्वश्च प्राणि°), which is further to be neuter (P. 2. 4. 17 : स नपुंसकम्). A neuter noun, further, has to have its final long vowel shortened (P. 1. 2. 47 : ह्रस्वो नपुंसके प्रातिपदिकस्य). The result of all this is that the compound was expected to be मुखनासिकव°. This being so, the final constituent has now to be mechanically extracted as -अवचन (शब्दस्त्वेवमवस्थितो मुखनासिकमवचनमस्येति). But if we do so, it gives an exactly opposite meaning. Hence the problem. So Bhar. says : तत्र शब्दो नार्थस्य सदृशः, नार्थः शब्दस्य. Kaiy. states the problem briefly and clearly thus : प्राण्यङ्गत्वात् समाहारद्वंद्वे ह्रस्वत्वेन भाव्यम्, अवचनमिति नञ्समासाश्रयणेऽर्थो न संगच्छते इति प्रश्नः — किमिदमिति ।

[1. 1]

निपातनाद्दीर्घत्वं भविष्यति. This is a part of the following *Mbh.* (which is in reply to the above question) : मुखं च नासिका च मुखनासिकम् । मुखनासिकं वचनमस्य सोऽयं मुखनासिकवचनः । यद्येवं मुखनासिकवचन इति प्राप्नोति । निपातनाद्दीर्घत्वं भविष्यति । The point of the reply is that the expression is not to be analysed as °नासिक + अवचनम् but as °नासिक + वचन itself, with the accompanying lengthening (°*kā*°) being demonstrated directly (निपातनात्), instead of being described by a rule. So no problem.

(*p.* 24, *l.* 23) अस्यायमभिप्रायः ... etc. The *Dīp.* brings out a hidden aspect of the meaning of the *Mbh.* It says that it should not be supposed that one form is current in the world and another — viz. lengthened — is employed in the Sū. In the actual usage also the long form alone is current (or should be used). This correctness is incidentally indicated by Pāṇini by uttering the long

form itself. He has similarly shown that the cerebralisation in सर्वनामन् is not correct (against his rule 8. 4. 3 : पूर्वपदात् संज्ञायामगः) by uttering the word without the cerebralisation in सर्वादीनि सर्वनामानि (P. 1. 1. 26). Cf. the *Vār*. 1 on it : सर्वनामसंज्ञायां निपातनाण्णत्वाभावः. Pāṇini is well known for his fondness of brevity and it is unthinkable that he should have used the long form without any purpose, or in plain words, carelessly. The long and short of this discussion is : मुखनासिकवचन इति न भवितव्यम्. The short form is clearly indicated to be incorrect by this Nipātana. (This statement is made, obviously enough, on the view : निपातनानां बाधकत्वम्. On the *abādhakatva*- view, however, even the short form also will have to be accepted as correct : अबाधकत्वपक्षे तु भाव्यमेव as Kaiy. says.)

Reading : In *l*. 26, the MS reads (wrongly) °नासिका° which is retained by AL also. However, AL make up for it by changing the following न into च so as to preserve the intended meaning.

(*p*. 25, *l*. 1) अथ त्वेवं कल्प्यते ... etc. Another way of interpreting the Nipātana. According to this interpretation even °*nāsika*° is as valid as °*nāsikā*°. This is the line of argument : P. 2. 2. 29 : चार्थे द्वंद्वः teaches the formation of the Dvandva compound in the meanings of *ca*. Out of the four meanings of *ca* two meanings, viz. इतरेतरभाव (mutual relatedness, with separateness intact) and समाहार (a collection) are admissible for the formation of the compound. (See the *Kāś*.). There is, further, freedom (*vivakṣā*) to look upon the objects concerned as characterised by either इतरेतरभाव or by समाहार. So, to start with (*prākṛta*) our compound can be both मुखनासिकावचन- (= मुखनासिके वचनं यस्य) or मुखनासिकवचन (= मुखनासिकं वचनं यस्य) optionally. Then comes the specific rule द्वंद्वश्च प्राणितूर्यसेनाङ्गानाम् which makes it compulsory that a compound of words expressive of parts of the body be necessarily (*nitya*) of the समाहार type, i. e. it must be neuter singular (with the further shortening of *ā* to *a*). This restricts the choice to only one alternative (°नासिक°), ruling out the other (°नासिका°). The original twofold form is set aside (बाधितम्). Finally, there is this Nipātana. What it does is that it cancels the restrictive rule द्वंद्वश्च ... etc., and thus revives (पुनःप्रसवः क्रियते) the original two forms. So even with the Nipātana, both forms are still valid (उभयथा भवितव्यम्).

(*p*. 25, *l*. 3) अन्ये तु नपुंसकलिङ्गतामेव विभाषयन्ति. A variation of the above view on the effect of the Nipātana in question. A *samāhāra* Dvandva, apart from being in the singular number — a logical necessity — has to be neuter also by P. 2. 4. 17 : स नपुंसकम् as said above. According to the view mentioned here, the Nipātana only loosens, optionally, the restriction of the neuter gender. So, if the option is exercised, the neuter goes, and along with it the shortening also taught in connection with it by P. 1. 2. 47 : ह्रस्वो नपुंसके ...,

The singular number of course remains. The result is that we can optionally have, in the present case, मुखं च नासिका च = मुखनासिका (!). This will finally give us मुखनासिकावचनः (along with मुखनासिक°, of course).

[1.2]

Observation: This section (1. 2), beginning with मुखनासिका° and ending with मुखग्रहणं प्रत्याचष्टे occurs here in the MS and we have also retained it here, though somewhat reluctantly. But it seems to be too early here. Its proper place is after the first topic, which deals with the consideration of the form °*nāsikā*°, is over and before the second topic viz. whether *mukha-* or *nāsikā-* can be dropped from the definition, begins (i. e. after the section 1. 5). This is also confirmed by the place of the corresponding discussion in the *Prad.* of Kaiy. However, taking into consideration the length of the passage and its retention here in the older eds., we have refrained from removing it bodily to its ideal place, in order to avoid confusion.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 4) मुखनासिकावचन इति केचित् विपरीतम् etc.

[*Observation*: There is neither a *pratīka* of the *Mbh.* quoted here, nor any introductory remark corresponding to अत्र चानेकं दर्शनम् of Kaiy. It is probable that some part of the *Dīp.* is lost here. This seems to be supported by the first two letters, नित, which do not make any sense by themselves. On the other hand, a word मुख, which is necessary, is missing.]

A nasal phoneme consists of a part produced by mouth and a part by nose. Now the question is: what is the sequence of these parts? (1) मुखभाग first, then नासिकाभाग, or (2) नासिकाभाग first, then मुखभाग? This portion seems to be lost in the *Dīp.* Before केचित् विपरीतं कल्पयन्ति, the *Dīp.* must have expressed one view (which one, No. 1 or 2, we do not know) while the second view must have followed केचित् विपरीतं कल्पयन्ति (as is clear from the sentence itself). This agrees well with the word उभयत्र in the next sentence which makes a statement which, the *Dīp.* says, applies whether one accepts one or other of the two views. The two views about the sequence of the two parts of a nasal phoneme are mentioned in the corresponding *Prad.* thus: अत्र चानेकं दर्शनम्। अनुनासिकस्य पूर्वः परो वा भागो मुखेनोच्चार्यते, भागो नासिकया. (The *Dīp.*, corresponding up to this much *Prad.*, is lost. It is available for what follows.) तत्र नासिकावचनभागानुरागवशात् मुखवचनोऽपि भागो नासिकावचन इव लक्ष्यते। यथा सय्ँयन्तेत्यत्रानुनासिकयकारानुरागाद् अकारोऽनुनासिक इव प्रतिभाति।

(*p.* 25, *l.* 5) उभयत्र तु नासिकाभागो ... etc. (For the corresponding *Prad* see above.) The *Dīp.* says that whatever view you adopt (उभयत्र) about the sequence, the part produced by the mouth, which should theoretically be pure,

gets a nasal tinge in practice by reason of the closeness of the nasal part. In the parallel cited (सयँ्यन्ता etc.), the *a* preceding *ỹ* (which latter comes from ं, P. 8. 4. 59, which in its turn itself comes from *m*, P. 8. 3. 23) is said to have similarly a nasal tinge.

(*p*. 25, *l*. 7) तत्र तु प्रासादवासिन्यायो नास्ति ... etc. This mention here of the प्रासादवासिन्याय is rather premature (but so in Kaiy. also), seeing that the maxim is yet to appear and to be explained in the *Mbh*.

This maxim is introduced in the *Mbh*. further on where the second topic, viz. whether we can dispense with the word *mukha-*, is discussed. The *Mbh*. there says that if we accept the प्रासादवासिन्याय we can dispense with the word *mukha-* and read the Sū. simply as *नासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः. This is how the maxim comes in : Those who live on the ground floor are called *bhūmivāsin*. Those who live on the upper floors are called *prāsādavāsin*. While those who live both on the ground floor and also on the upper floor are simply called either *bhūmivāsin* or *prāsādavāsin*. A single qualification for *-vāsin* suffices. Similarly here a *nasal* phoneme, since it is produced both by mouth and also by nose could be simply defind *nāsikāvacana-* (or, for that matter, even *mukhavacana*). Read : मुखग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम्। केनेदानीमुभयवचनानां भविष्यति? प्रासादवासिन्यायेन। तद्यथा — केचित् प्रासादवासिनः, केचिद् भूमिवासिनः, केचिदुभयवासिनः। ये प्रासादवासिनः, गृह्यन्ते ते प्रासादवासिग्रहणेन। ये भूमिवासिनः, गृह्यन्ते ते भूमिवासिग्रहणेन। य उभयवासिनः, गृह्यन्त एव ते प्रासादवासिग्रहणेन भूमिवासिग्रहणेन च। एवमिहापि केचिन्मुखवचनाः, केचिन्नासिकावचनाः, केचिदुभयवचनाः। तत्र ये मुखवचनाः, गृह्यन्ते ते मुखग्रहणेन। ये नासिकावचनाः, गृह्यन्ते ते नासिकाग्रहणेन, ये उभयवचनाः, गृह्यन्त एव ते मुखग्रहणेन नासिकाग्रहणेन च (*Mbh*.)। Thus on the strength of the Resident-of-the-upper-floors maxim Pat. does away with the *mukha-* part in the definition.

Bhar. now says that this maxim is applicable where a single indivisible thing is connected, as a whole, with more than one property. In this case any single property suffices as a characteristic mark for the definition or description of an object : the property of *bhūmivāsa* for the descriptive name *bhūmivāsin* (although the person concerned may have both the properties). If, however, it is shown (or believed) that the object is not really one indivisible, but that it consists of parts and that the different parts are connected with different properties — not one object as a whole connected with all different properties — then the प्रासादवासिन्याय does not apply.

It is this aspect of the maxim which concerns us here. When one says that a nasal phoneme has two parts, and that one of them is *mukhavacana*, and the other *nāsikāvacana*, then the maxim does not apply. The result is, that on this view about the composition of a nasal phoneme, the definition नासिकावचन

will not do. It will have to be मुखनासिकावचनः as Pāṇini has given it. This is what is implied by the *Dīp.* : तत्र तु प्रासादवासिन्यायो नास्ति.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 7) यथा स्वरिते भागप्रविभाग ... etc. The *Dīp.* gives a parallel to the non-application of the maxim. It is grammatical, viz. about the vowel called *svarita* (circumflex). Pāṇini defines this *svarita* vowel as a combination of *udātta* and *anudātta* (उच्चैरुदात्तः। नीचैरनुदात्तः। समाहारः स्वरितः। (P. 1. 2. 29–31.) He further demarcates the limits of the *udātta* and *anudātta* parts of a circumflex vowel (*ac*) by saying that its initial part, having the length of ½ mora is *udātta* (and the rest is, by implication, *anuddātta*), cf. P. 1. 2. 32 : तस्यादित उदात्तमर्धह्रस्वम्. Bhar. says that in Pāṇini's view the property *udātta* belongs to one part. and *anudātta* to the other. The whole (phoneme) cannot be said to have both the properties. That is why, suggests Bhar., Pāṇini could not call such a vowel simply उदात्त or अनुदात्त (*उदात्तः स्वरितः or *अनुदात्तः स्वरितः) the प्रासादवासिन्याय being not available. As to the property actually possessed by the whole, it is गुणान्तर, a third different property altogether viz. the combination of the two. (Hence the mention of both the properties (समाहारः) in the definition.)

(*p.* 25, *l.* 8) यथा 'कल्माषः', 'सारङ्गः' etc. A parallel to the समुदायस्तु गुणान्तरयुक्तः. White is one thing. Black is another. A colour which is produced from the mixture of the two is a third colour (गुणान्तरयुक्तः), different from the two. Such an object cannot be said to have two colours, black and white. So it cannot be described as 'having black colour' or 'having white colour'. A new name has to be used : grey (कल्माषः, सारङ्गः). (The parallel is used in the *Mbh.* in connection with *svarita* itself, see I. 208. 6–9.)—न भवति ग्रहणं समुदायस्य =केवलेन उदात्तेन अनुदात्तेन वा तयोः समाहारवतोरचोः ग्रहणं न भवति।

Kaiy. follows : अत्र च प्रासादवासिन्यायो नास्ति, भागस्यैव मुखेन नासिकया च (=एकस्य भागस्य मुखेन, अपरस्य च नासिकया) उच्चारणात्, न तु समग्रस्य (उभाभ्यामुच्चारणात्)।

(*p.* 25, *l.* 9) अस्मिंस्तु दर्शने पाणिनिना ... etc. Bhar. points out the difference of opinion between Pāṇini and Pat. अस्मिन् दर्शने=अनुनासिकस्य वर्णस्य द्वौ भागौ, एको मुखेन उच्चार्यते, अपरश्च नासिकया इति दर्शने. Since Pāṇini seems to have believed that a nasal phoneme has two parts, produced at two different points of articulation, the प्रासादवासिन्याय was not available to him. So he had to use both *mukha-* and *nāsikā*. Pat. (चूर्णिकारः), however, does not recognize parts (भागप्रविभागमनाश्रित्य). He thinks that the phoneme as a whole has a twofold place of articulation (कृत्स्न एव वर्णः उभयस्थानः). So, relying on the प्रासादवासिन्याय, he can reject the word *mukha-* (मुखग्रहणं प्रत्याचष्टे).

आष्ट्रपकः किलोखापकश्च etc. Bhar. adds another न्याय (only it is not so expressly called) to support the प्रासादवासिन्याय. An article of food which requires

cooking (frying/roasting) on both kinds of pans called भ्राष्ट्र and उखा is called either भ्राष्ट्रपक्व or उखापक्व. Similarly नासिकावचनः (for मुखनासिकावचनः). Kaiy. follows : यदा सर्व एव वर्णा मुखेनोच्चार्यंते नासिकया च तदा प्रासादवासिन्यायेन भाष्यकारो मुखग्रहणं प्रत्याचष्टे। यथा भ्राष्ट्रेणोखया च पक्वः सूप उभाभ्यां व्यपदिश्यते। (Here again, उभाभ्यां व्यपदिश्यते=भ्राष्ट्रपक्व इति वा, उखापक्व इति वा निर्दिश्यते। The word उभाभ्याम् does not mean *भ्राष्ट्रोखापक्व इति संयुक्तरूपेण!)

Readings : (1) (*p*. 25, *l*. 4) For नित(? मुख) and the two gaps see notes above. — (2) (*p*. 25, *l*. 5) The gap of four letters in the MS after [अ]न्यवर्णस्थो is correctly filled by AL with ऽनुनासिको. We follow it. — (3) (*p*. 25, *l*. 6) The letter between ल and ते is not clear in the MS. It could be either भ्य (as AL take it) or क्ष्य (as Sw takes it). If we follow AL and read इवोपलभ्यते, we have to supply a प. If we follow Sw and read इवालक्ष्यते, we have to ignore the stroke on वा (=वो). We prefer लक्ष्यते. — (4) (*p*. 25, *l*. 7) MS भागप्रविगाभावात्; AL Sw °प्रविभागाभावात् (for our °प्रविभागभावात्, so emended in view of the meaning intended). — (5) (*p*. 25, *l*. 8) The MS reads the *Dīp*. अवयवौ तस्यो ... समुदायस्येति after प्रतिपद्यते (नैष दोषः). It is already restored to its proper place here by the eds. — (6) (*p*. 25, *l*. 11) AL drop यथा. — (7) (*p*. 25, *l*. 11) MS किलोसी-; Sw किलोसा- (for किलोखा-). — (8) (*p*. 25, *l*. 12) MS Sw किलोशी- (for किलोखा-).

Observation : As remarked previously (*p*. 198, *ll*. 4 ff.), the whole section (1. 2) is misplaced in the MS. It should be after the end of 1. 5.

[1. 3]

ईषद्वचनमावचनम्. The *Mbh*. referred to here runs thus : अथ वा मुखनासिकमावचनमस्य सोऽयं मुखनासिकावचनः। अथ किमिदमावचनमिति? ईषद्वचनमावचनम्। किंचिन्मुखवचनं किंचिन्नासिकावचनम्।

After the Nipātana, this is another attempt to avoid the alleged incorrect form °*nāsikā*°. It is suggested that the last constituent of the compound is not *-vacana*, but *-āvacana* (i. e. °*sika* + *āvacana*). So the desired short form is already there. No problem. (Of course you could still take the preceding form as *nāsikā-* if you wanted it. But that is a different thing.) The *Mbh*. explains *āvacanam* = *īṣad vacanam* where *īṣad* means 'partly'. The definition says that a nasal is a phoneme which is partly produced by mouth and partly be nose.

(*p*. 25, *l*. 14) स हि वर्णो न ... etc. Bhar. explains the mechanism of the utterance of a nasal phoneme on this *āvacana* alternative. The outgoing breath first strikes either at the *mukha* or at the *nose* and then, with its force unexhausted (अनुपरतशक्तिना) strikes at the other place. The whole phoneme is thus uttered with a single breath, i. e. with a single effort, so to say. — अन्यतरस्मिन् (करणे)=मुखे नासिकायां वा (whichever you think comes into contact first with

...26

the outgoing breath). Similarly अन्यतरत्र करणे=मुखे नासिकायां वा (whichever you think comes into contact with breath subsequently). आत्मव्यक्तिं लभते or प्रतिपद्यते, finds self-expression, is realized.

The *Dīp.* ईषन्मुखस्य व्यापार ईषन्नासिकायाः paraphrases the *Mbh.* : किंचिन्मुखवचनं किंचिन्नासिकावचनम्.

Observation : The *Dīp.* स हि वर्णो ... प्रतिपद्यत इति is quoted (with variants) by Nāg. in his comm. on Kaiy. under the latter's comm. on the *Mbh.* मुखोपसंहिता वा नासिका etc. The remarkable thing is that tha passage has been cited expressly under the name of Hari. Since the passage is not quoted by Kaiy. in his *Prad.*. Nāg. did not get it through him. And since it is not known to be quoted elsewhere in grammatical works, this is an unmistakable proof that Nāg. had the *Dīp.* directly before him. Read : भ्राष्ट्रेण चेति। एतेन कण्ठादिकं तु स्थानं नासिका तु करणमिति मन्दोक्तमपास्तम्। अत एवात्र सूत्रे हरिणा 'स हि वर्णो न मुखेनैव नापि नासिकयैव चात्मवृत्तिं लभते, किं तु वायुनानुपरतशक्तिनान्यतरकरणमभिहत्यान्यतरकरणेऽभिहन्यमाने आत्मवृत्तिं लभते' इत्युक्तम्। (Nirṇ. ed. 1951, vol. I, *p.* 236, *col.* 2, *ll.* 14–19). In spite of many variants, the identity is unmistakable.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 16) अत्रापि सामान्यशब्दस्य ... etc. A question could arise here : On the present view (अत्र=किंचिन्मुखवचनं किंचिन्नासिकावचनम् *Mbh.* or ईषन्मुखस्य व्यापार ईषन्नासिकायाः *Dīp.*), is an expression मुखनासिकवचन also valid? Will such an expression be reasonable, since only a part, and not the whole, is now supposed to be produced by *mukha* etc.? (It is presumed that here one does not want to use *ā*; आङ्रहितस्येति शेषः as Nāg. says.) The reply is given in the affirmative. उच्यते is a general statement while ईषदुच्यते is only its particular variety. General is present in every particular. What applies to ईषदुच्यते also applies to उच्यते.

Similarly Kaiy., including the example of *īṣacchukla* and *śukla*. (He does not reproduce *īṣaddūra* and *dūra*.) Nāg. brings out the unexpresed objection thus : ननु भागस्य मुखाद्युच्चार्यत्वेन मुखनासिकं वचनमुच्चारणकरणं यस्य वर्णस्येत्यर्थको मुखनासिकवचन इति प्रयोगस्तत्रासंगतोऽत आह — यौ हीति।

Reading : (*p.* 25, *l.* 15) AL Sw चात्मव्यक्तिं. — (2) (*p.* 25, *l.* 18) Sw ऽप्यसौ (for ह्यसौ).

[1. 4]

मुखद्वितीया वा नासिका वचनमस्य. Another alternative solution. This time it is refused to look upon the compound with *nāsikā* as a Dvandva (which results into the shortening °*nāsikā*° > °*nāsika*° and the neuter gender). Instead it is claimed that *mukha* is first compounded into a Bahu° compound with *dvitīya* (=*sahāya*) viz. *mukhadvitīyā* which then forms a Karmadhāraya compound with *nāsikā*. In this process the middle constituent *dvitīya* is deleted on the

model of *śākapārthiva* (P. 2. 1· 69, *Vār.* 8). Finally, *mukhanāsikā* forms a *Bahu°* with *vacana*. The definition would then mean '(a phoneme) uttered by means of nose assisted by mouth is (named) *anunāsika*.'

The citation असिद्वितीयो etc. is quoted in the *Mbh.* under P. 2. 2. 24 *Vār.* 22.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 22) तत्र साहचर्यात् नासिका ... etc. Although to all appearances this passage is an expansion of the interpretation of the compound *mukhanāsikā* given in the *Mbh.*, actually it offers rather an *alternative* interpretation to it (implying disapproval of the *śākapārthivādi* interpretation of this compound). In this interpretation *mukhanāsikā* is looked upon as a *karmadhāraya* of two nouns in apposition, the *nāsikā* being identified with *mukha* on account of close association with it.

Kaiy. faithfully follows Bhar. (except that he does not say शाकपार्थिवादित्वात् समासः). Read : मुखद्वितीयेति । मुखसहायेत्यर्थः । तत्र नासिका मुखसाहचर्यान्मुखशब्देनोच्यते । मुखं च तन्नासिका च मुखनासिका । सा वचनमस्येति ।

Bhar. and Kaiy. have not made it clear why they are averse to take *mukhanāsikā* as compound of the *śākapārthiva* type (a term which Pat. has not expressly used but is nevertheless implied by his analysis of the compound and which actually occurs in the *Dīp.* itself). Nāg., however, offers an explanation. He says : शाकपार्थिवत्वादुत्तरपदलोपे शब्दानित्यत्वापत्तिरत आह — तत्रेति । (But he himself differs. Read : परं त्विदं चिन्त्यम्, भाष्यकृतैवं रीत्या तदप्रख्यानात्.) We do not know whether Bhar. and Kaiy. had really this point in mind. (Indeed, it does not seem that *lopa* and *śabdanityatva* are incompatible with each other. Cf. the *Vār.* : किमर्थं शास्त्रमिति चेन्निवर्तकत्वात् सिद्धम् which is repeated in the *Mbh.* under our Sū. (P. 1. 1. 8) itself later on (the first occurrence as *Vār.* 10 on P. 1. 1. 1), according to which all processes such as augmentation, elision, transformation etc. take place only mentally; the *nitya-śabda* remains unaffected.)

Lastly Kaiy.'s brief comment on the *Vār.* (8) : समानाधिकरणाधिकारे शाकपार्थिवादीनामुपसंख्यानमुत्तरपदलोपश्च (on P. 2. 1. 69) is worth quoting. It reads : शाकभोजीति । शाकभोजित्वात् तत्साहचर्यात् तद्व्यपदेशाच्चार्थे उत्तरपदलोपेनेत्याहुः । Here also (as in the case of our *mukhanāsikā*) Kaiy. has referred to his (and Bhar.'s) argument of तत्साहचर्यात् तद्व्यपदेशः.

It seems to us that Bhar. and Kaiy. do not want to contradict directly Kāt. and Pat. So what they just do is to pass off their own interpretation as if it was what Kāt. really meant when he taught *uttarapadalopa*.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 23) अत्रापि न दण्डवारितो द्वंद्वः ... etc. This comp. (Karmadh°) does not rule out a Dvandva. One can form it if one has such a *vivakṣā*. (The

reference is to the *Mbh.* योऽपि हि तत्पुरुषमारभते न तस्य दण्डवारितो बहुव्रीहिः under P. 2. 1. 24, *Vār.* 5 [I. 383. 19]. So, alternatively, मुखनासिकवचनः also is valid. (AL read here °नासिका° but that does not seem to be correct.)

[1.5]

मुखोपसंहिता वा नासिकेति. Another solution. Outwardly it does not look to be much different from the preceding (1. 4), but Bhar. (also Kaiy.) sees a deeper meaning in it.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 24) केचिद् वर्णयन्ति etc. The *Dīp.* begins with rejection of the reason given by some for suggesting this solution when the preceding one, which is practically the same, is already there. They say that there is no sanction for the deletion of the *uttarapada* (viz. -*dvitīya*) in the preceding solution. In the present solution, however, the deletion of *uttarapada* (viz. -उपसंहित) is sanctioned by P. 2. 1. 34-35, *Vār.* 4: सिद्धं तु समानाधिकरणाधिकारे क्तस्तृतीयापूर्वपद उत्तरपदलोपश्च. The *Mbh.* on this *Vār.* runs as follows: सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्? समानाधिकरणाधिकारे (i. e. P. 1. 2. 42 ff.) वक्तव्यं क्तस्तृतीयापूर्वपदः [क्तः=क्तान्तः] समस्यते सुपोत्तरपदस्य च लोपो भवतीति। दध्नोपसिक्तो दध्युपसिक्तः, दध्युपसिक्त ओदनो दध्योदनः। ... The contention is that on the model of दध्युपसिक्त we can have a compound मुखोपसंहिता. The *uttarapada* is subsequently deleted when a compound with *vacana* takes place.

Before we pass on to the refutation of this view by Bhar., a point has to be raised. The *Dīp.* says that according to *kecit* there is no grammatical justification or sanction (*anvākhyānam*) for the deletion of *uttarapada* in *mukhadvitīyā*. But is not P. 2. 1. 69, *Vār.* 8: समानाधिकरणाधिकारे शाक ... etc. a sufficient *anvākhyāna*? Also, it is not refuted later unlike the present P. 2. 1. 34-35, *Vār.* 4 as we shall presently see.

(*p.* 25, *l.* 26) एतच्चासत्। लोपस्य तत्र प्रत्याख्यातत्वात्. The reasoning of *kecit* is not correct because the *Vār.* 4 on P. 2. 1. 34-35 is refuted in the *Mbh.* The reason given there is that words like *upasikta* are not seen in a phrase (*asamāse*), so grammar has no business to teach its deletion in a compound. Read: 'न वासमासेऽदर्शनात्। (वा. ६)।' न वा वक्तव्यम्। किं कारणम्? असमासेऽदर्शनात्। यद् ध्यसमासे दृश्यते, समासे च न दृश्यते, तल्लोपारम्भं प्रयोजयति। न चासमास उपसिक्तशब्दः ... दृश्यते।

(*p.* 25, *l.* 27) तस्मादनेनैतत् प्रतिपादयति ... etc. Bhar. now gives what he thinks is the real significance of this alternative. The place of articulation of a nasal is neither mouth as such nor nose as such. It is altogether different from them (स्थानान्तरमन्यदेव). It is intermediary (अन्तरालम्) between the two. It is called मुखनासिका because it is near these two. — गङ्गायमुनयोर्वेणिका, the mixed up water of Gaṅgā and Yamunā, which can neither be strictly called Gaṅgā

nor Yamunā. In this view the nasal is not uttered in two places. Hence अस्मिन्नपि प्रासादवासिन्यायो दुर्लभः।

Cf. Kaiy.: मुखस्य च नासिकायाश्चान्तरालं स्थानान्तरमेवानुनासिकस्य दर्शयति। तत्र सामीप्यान्मुखं च तन्नासिका चेत्युभाभ्यामन्तरालं व्यपदिश्यते। ... अत्रापि नास्ति प्रासादवासिन्यायः।

(*p*. 26, *l*. 2) ननु चैतस्यां कल्पनायां ... etc. An objection is here raised and answered. This is the objection (in connection with the 3rd and the 4th alternative): वचन is formed from वच् + ल्युट् (= अन) by P. 3. 3. 117: करणाधिकरणयोश्च in the sense of an instrument. It is adjective, and so subordinate, to the substantive viz. मुखनासिका. Therefore it will have to be in feminine which in this case, is formed with *ṅīp* = ई (P. 4. 1. 15: टिड्ढाणञ् ...). With वचनी as the final constituent the compound should have been *मुखनासिकावचनीकः (with *kap* by P. 5. 4. 153: नद्यृतश्च). How does Pāṇini then use मुखनासिकावचनः?

नैष दोषः ... etc. gives the reply. The word वचन is not subordinate. Being first formed independently (उच्यते ऽनेनेति वचनम्) it is principal and always neuter in this sense. It is the expression मुखनासिका which qualifies it. And surely what is principal does not assume the gender of the subordinate (qualifying) word.

As a parallel (this time it is number, not gender) for the principal not adopting the feature of the subordinate, Bhar. cites the case of a substantive *go* 'bull, cow' and an adjective to it, *viṁśati* 'twenty'. This can be expressed in two ways, विंशतिर्गावः or गवां विंशतिः, both meaning one and the same thing. The difference in the two constructions is that the first phrase is गुणिप्रधान (the substantive गावः is dominant) while गवां विंशतिः is गुणप्रधान (the qualifying word विंशति in the Nominative is dominant). Now विंशतिः is singular, but the principal substantive *go* does not change its plural to singular. — Before न (*l*. 6), scil. प्रधानेन गुणसंख्यायाः प्रतिपत्तिः.

Kaiy. brings in the *padasaṁskāra* and the *vākyasaṁskāra* views. When you form *vacana* independently before connecting it with *mukhanāsikā*, you have followed the *padasaṁskāra* view. If, however, you follow the *vākyasaṁskāra* view and connect the word *vacana* with *mukhanāsika* even while the former is being formed, feminine gender is inevitable and you will necessarily have to say मुखनासिकावचनीकः, adds Kaiy. Read: पदसंस्कारपक्षे तु मुखनासिकानिरपेक्षं वचनमिति लिङ्गसर्वनामनपुंसकाश्रयेण संस्क्रियते। पश्चात् स्त्रीत्वस्य पदान्तरसंबन्धेन प्रतीयमानत्वाद् बहिरङ्गत्वात् ङीप् प्रत्ययो न भवति। यदा तु स्त्रीत्वाश्रयेण वचनीति पदं व्युत्पाद्यते तदा मुखनासिकावचनीक इत्येव भवति।

Readings: (1) (*p*. 26, *l*. 5) MSSw इत्येव. — (2) (*p*. 26, *l*. 6) MSSw गावो विंशति (Sw °तिः) (for गवां विंशतिः, as emended in AL).

[2]

यमानुस्वाराणामेवेति. Here Pat. is discussing whether the word मुख can be dropped from the Sū. The *Mbh.* runs thus : अथ मुखग्रहणं किमर्थम् ? 'नासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः' इतीयत्युच्यमाने यमानुस्वाराणामेव प्रसज्येत। मुखग्रहणे पुनः क्रियमाणे न दोषो भवति। Here some portion of the *Dīp.* has been lost in the MS which reads चैतस्मिन् न्याये immediately after गवां विंशतिः. We take it (following Sw) that at least the *Mbh. pratīka* यमानुस्वाराणामेवेति along with the following first word of the *Dīp.* viz. असति is lost.

The *Mbh.* makes the statement यमानुस्वाराणामेव from Pāṇini's point of view, i. e. when we do not take into consideration the प्रासादवासिन्याय which is first introduced by Pat. Hence the *Dīp.* : असति चैतस्मिन् न्याये (= Kaiy. : प्रासादवासिन्यायानवतारपक्ष इति भावः) etc. In Pāṇini's grammar only *yama*-s and the *anusvāra* are produced by nose. If one were to read the definition as *नासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः it will apply only to *yama*-s and the *anusvāra*, the nasal consonants being now excluded as they are not नासिकावचन, but मुखनासिकावचन. (ङ : कण्ठ + नासिका. ञ् : तालु + नासिका etc.)

(*p.* 26, *l.* 7) दोष एव भवति ... etc. The defect that would result (*Dīp.* : दोष एव भवति) from the hypothetical formation *नासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः is illustrated in the *Dīp.* by citing three sūtras where an *anunāsika* is taught as a substitute in certain environments. They are :

(1) P. 6. 1. 126 : आङोऽनुनासिकश्छन्दसि. Acc. to this rule the prefix *ā* is replaced by *ā̐* (nasal *ā*) before a vowel in the Veda, e. g. अभ्र आँ अपः (ṚV 5. 48. 1).

(2) P. 8. 4. 57 : अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्यानुनासिकः. Acc. to this rule *ă*, *ĭ*, *ŭ* are optionally replaced by their nasal counterparts before pause, when they are not Pragṛhya. For example, दधि, मधु can become दधिँ मधुँ, in the above environment.

(3) P. 8. 4. 45 : यरोऽनुनासिकेऽनुनासिको वा. Acc. to this rule a consonant (except *h*) is optionally replaced by a nasal before a nasal. Thus वाङ् नयति or वाग् न°.

Here the difficulty is that the nasal vowels in the first two cases and nasal consonants in the last case, which have a claim to come in as substitutes because of *āntaratamya*, cannot come in as substitutes (अन्तरतमस्याभावात्), as they are now excluded from the definition *anunāsika*. As a result the *yama*-s and the *anusvāra* alone become due as substitutes, whether one likes it or not (प्राप्नुवन्ति = आदेशत्वेन प्राप्नुवन्ति.)

In the *Dīp.* ये त्वन्ये विड्वनोरनुनासिकस्य ... etc. (*l.* 10) it is pointed out that there is a different kind of difficulty in rules where the term *anunāsika* is used not as a predicate, but as a part of the subject, i.e. where something replaces an *anunāsika*. For example, P. 6. 4. 41 : विड्वनोरनुनासिकस्यात् teaches that before the suffixes *viṭ* and *van* the final radical nasal is replaced by *ā* (e. g. *abjā-* fr. *ap* + *jan* + *viṭ*; *agregāḥ* fr. *agre* + *gam* + *viṭ*, the suffix *viṭ* in both by P. 3. 2. 67 : जनसनखनक्रमगमो विट्; *vijāvan* fr. *vi* + *jan* + *van*(*ip*) by P. 3. 2. 74–75 : आतो मनिन्क्वनिब्वनिपश्च । अन्येभ्योऽपि दृश्यन्ते ।). Rules like P. 6. 4. 41 will now cease to operate (असंभवः), because there are no verbal roots which end in *yama* or *anusvāra*.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 12) येषां तु 'यमानुस्वाराणामपि' इति ग्रन्थः ... etc. The *Dīp.* refers to a *v. l.* अपि for एव here in the *Mbh.* The word अपि shows that some other phonemes *also* become due as *anunāsika* substitutes. They can be none else than the nasal consonants (*n*, *m* etc.). Bhar. adds that those who read *api* must be having प्रासादवासिन्याय in mind without which *n*, *m* etc. cannot get the designation *anunāsika* by the definition *नासिकावचनोऽनुनासिकः.

In the *Dīp.* एवं च सत्यन्तरतमाः ... etc. Bhar. says that there will be no harm. Even if the *yama*-s and the *anusvāra* present themselves, claiming for substitution, they will be excluded on the principle of *āntaratamya*. So only nasal consonants, the desired substitutes, will remain in the field. In this connection the *Dīp.* quotes the *Mbh.* नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम् which appears as the *pratīka* later below (*l.* 22) in this section itself. — एवं च सति ... (*l.* 14) means ञमङणनैः सह यमानुस्वारेष्वपि प्राप्तेषु.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 14) कचटतपानामेव प्रसज्येत. The *Mbh.* is now discussing whether the word °*nāsikā*° could be dropped and the Sū. read as *मुखवचनोऽनुनासिकः. अथ नासिकाग्रहणं किमर्थम्? is the question raised and the reply given as : 'मुखवचनोऽनुनासिकः' इतीयत्युच्यमाने कचटतपानामेव प्रसज्येत । नासिकाग्रहणे पुनः क्रियमाणे न दोषो भवति।

The *Dīp.* एवं च सति पक्वम् ... etc. illustrates the undesired result of this. In *pakva*, the root final *c*, now designated as *anunāsika*, will have to be deleted because a *jhal* suffix *ta* (its substitute *va* is here *asiddha*) follows (P. 6. 4. 37 : अनुदात्तोपदेश ... etc.). Similarly, lengthening of the radical vowel in ओदनपच् 'one who cooks rice' (fr. ओदन+पच्+क्विप्) will result undesiredly by P. 6. 4. 15 : अनुनासिकस्य क्विझलोः क्ङिति.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 17) प्रासादवासिन्यायेन. This maxim and the purpose for which it is introduced in the *Mbh.* has been already explained fully above (1. 2).

Here in अयं प्रासादवासिन्यायः क्रियानिमित्तेषु व्यपदेशेषु वर्तते ... etc. Bhar. discusses an important aspect of this maxim. The प्रासादवासिन्याय is admitted in

grammar only when a designation (like मुखनासिकावचन) is used significantly, i. e. where the sense conveyed is true to letters (to be more faithful : where the action conveyed by the verbal root is at the basis of the designation : क्रियानिमित्तेषु व्यपदेशेषु). The term नासिकावचन (or मुखवचन), which can be used for मुखनासिकावचन, is neither a popular one (प्रसिद्धं) nor defined in any grammar (परिभाषितं). This is just as is the case in the parallel where a person is called प्रासादवासिन् (or भूमिवासिन्) because he actually resides on both the floors; it is not just a conventional expression.

It must be said that the construction of the sentence यथा कश्चित् ... उभाभ्यां व्यपदिश्यते is somewhat clumsy. It should have been something like this : यथा प्रासादवासित्वं भूमिवासित्वं वा न रूढिनिमित्तम्, कश्चित् क्रियानिमित्तमेव [प्रासादवासी, भूमिवासी] इति उभाभ्यां व्यपदिश्यते ... etc. — Kaiy. states the restriction very mechanically : अयं न्यायः क्रियाशब्देष्वेव, न रूढेषु.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 22) नैव दोषो न प्रयोजनम्. For the explanation of this *Mbh.* (and the *Dīp.* on it), see Notes above (under *p.* 26, *l.* 12).

Readings : (1) (*p.* 26, *l.* 7) यमानुस्वाराणामेवेति । असति dropped in the MS (see Notes) — (2) (*p.* 26, *l.* 10) AL drop एव. — (3) (*p.* 26, *l.* 10) The MS does not read विवड्नोर. — (4) (*p.* 26, *l.* 20) MSSw परिभापितं (for °भाषितं as in AL).

[3]

इतरेतराश्रय उक्तम्. This is a part of a *samādhāna-Vārttika*. A question about mutual dependence (regarded as a defect) is raised here and the reply is given that a similar question was already raised and replied. That reply holds good here also. The *Mbh.* reads :

इतरेतराश्रयं तु भवति । केतरेतराश्रयता? सतोऽनुनासिकस्य संज्ञया भवितव्यम्, संज्ञया च नामानुनासिको भाव्यते, तदितरेतराश्रयं भवति । इतरेतराश्रयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते । 'अनुनासिकसंज्ञायामितरेतराश्रय उक्तम्' (वा. १)। It is pointed out that you give the name *anunāsika* to a phoneme which is already there (सतः) and then you use the term to produce an *anunāsika*. This involves the defect of mutual dependence. Then Kāt. says that a reply to such an objection has been already given.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 24) क्व 'where', asks the *Dīp.* and itself replies : वृद्धिसंज्ञायाम्, under P. 1. 1. 1 where a similar name, viz. *vṛddhi* is discussed.[1]

---

1. The objection under P. 1. 1. 1 is similar : 'सतो वृद्ध्यादिषु संज्ञाभावात् तदाश्रय इतरेतराश्रयत्वादप्रसिद्धिः (वा. ८)'। सतः संज्ञिनः संज्ञाभावात् तदाश्रये = संज्ञाश्रये संज्ञिनि वृद्ध्यादिष्वितरेतराश्रयत्वादप्रसिद्धिः। केतरेतराश्रयता ? सतामादैचां संज्ञया भवितव्यम्, संज्ञया चादैचो भाव्यन्ते तदितरेतराश्रयं भवति। इतरेतराश्रयाणि च कार्याणि न प्रकल्पन्ते।

The *Mbh.* (under our Sū. P. 1. 1. 8) continues : किमुक्तम् ? 'सिद्धं तु नित्यशब्दत्वात्' इति। नित्याः शब्दाः । नित्येषु च शब्देषु सतोऽनुनासिकस्य संज्ञा क्रियते, न संज्ञयानुनासिको भाव्यते। यदि तर्हि नित्याः शब्दाः, किमर्थं शास्त्रम् ? 'किमर्थं शास्त्रमिति चेन्निवर्तकत्वात् सिद्धम्'। निवर्तकं शास्त्रम्। कथम् ? आङस्मा अविशेषेणोपदिष्टो ऽननुनासिकः। तस्य सर्वत्राननुनासिकबुद्धिः प्रसक्ता। तत्रानेन निवृत्तिः क्रियते — छन्दस्यचि परत आङोऽननुनासिकस्य प्रसङ्गेऽनुनासिकः साधुर्भवतीति।

The moral of this *Mbh.* (repeated [इह तु पुनरुच्यते।] from the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 1) is this : (1) The phoneme named *anunāsika* always exists. It is not produced by means of the name. Only a name is given to what always exists. (2) Since *śabda* is *nitya*, no change in it is possible. All the phonetic changes taught in grammar take place only mentally.

(*p.* 26, *l.* 24) अस्य निदर्शनार्थम्। अनुनासिकसंज्ञा ... etc.

Observation : The MS seems to be corrupt here. The MS gives a *daṇḍa* after उच्यते. But अस्य निदर्शनार्थम् seems to be connected with the preceding sentence rather than with the following (अनुनासिकसंज्ञा etc.). So we make अस्य निदर्शनार्थम् a subordinate clause, giving reason for पुनरुच्यते. The MS actually reads — दर्शनार्थं°. Following the older eds. we supply नि in the blank space (though that is not very satisfactory either). अनुनासिकसंज्ञा seems to start a new sentence, although the MS and the eds. tag on अस्य निदर्शनार्थं to it.

अस्य निदर्शनार्थम् is vague. It may mean 'for demonstrating' or 'as an illustration' 'to show' (how there is no इतरेतराश्रय in the definition of *anunāsika* also as in that of Vṛddhi).

With संहितावसानसंज्ञावत् लोकविदितत्वात् ... etc., cf. P. 1. 4. 110, *Vār.* 8 : संहितावसानयोर्लोकविदितत्वात् सिद्धम् which regards the two definitions as superfluous. दोषः=इतरेतराश्रयः.

* * *

P. 1. 1. 9 : *tulyāsyaprayatnaṁ savarṇam*

[1]

(*p.* 27, *l.* 2) प्रदेश, a rule wherein an operation is taught (as against rules teaching *saṁjñā*-s, *paribhāṣā*-s etc.).

शास्त्रं गुरु संपद्यत इति संज्ञाप्रणयनम् — Cf. the oft-repeated statement in the *Mbh.* : लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम्.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 3) अत्र च यथाश्रुतपदानुग्रह ... etc. Here Bhar. is justifying the analysis of *āsyaprayatna* as a Dvandva given in the *Mbh.* He gives two alternative explanations. (1) Before the meaning is understood (अदृष्टार्थे), it is just

natural that on merely hearing two nominals, they should be understood as a Dvandva : a word A *and* a word B. The other analyses suggest themselves only when the meaning is known. (2) Pat. takes the compound as Dvandva because the *Vār*. takes that analysis for granted. — Here the MS is corrupt. For readings, see below : *Readings*.

[1. 1]

(*p*. 27, *l*. 6) केचित् तुल्यमिति ... etc. Bhar. here refutes the view held by some that the meaning ' similar, same ' etc. which the word *tulya* actually conveys in the parlance is a figurative meaning (*lākṣaṇika* as it is called by later rhetoricians), a development of the primary meaning (as it is styled by the later rhetoricians) viz. तुलया संमितम् ' weighed by balance ' as given by Pāṇini (in 4. 4. 91) and as repeated by Pat. here. The derivation is just for vouching the acceptability (*sādhutva*) of the word. It has no semantic significance. The meaning ' similar ' etc. is just a primary meaning, based on convention, having nothing to do with measuring by a balance.

(*p*. 27, *l*. 7) तुल्यमित्युक्ते सर्वत्र ... etc. Two reasons are given for rejecting the figurative meaning view (गुणकल्पनम्). (1) When the word *tulya* is uttered, one straightway understands the meaning ' similar '. Nobody thinks, or is required to think, of the balance or its activity for the understanding of the intended meaning. (2) A figurative meaning of a word cannot be understood if the word concerned is uttered alone, without being accompanied by another word which would give a clue to the intended figurative meaning. For example, the word *gaṅgā*, if unaccompanied by a word like *ghoṣa* ' a hamlet ', will not by itself be able to convey the intended figurative meaning, viz. ' the bank of the Gaṅgā '. In the present case, however, the meaning ' similar ' can be understood from *tulya*, without any accompanying word. Hence the conclusion : तस्मात् ... रूढिशब्दोऽयम् (just like the words कुशलः etc.). अर्थप्रकरण ' meaning-context ' is practically equivalent to तात्पर्यानुपपत्ति ' the otherwise impossibility of understanding the meaning intended by the speaker ', which latter (or अन्वयानुपपत्ति according to some) is a precondition for understanding *lakṣaṇā*.

(*p*. 27, *l*. 9) व्युत्पत्तिकर्मणि केवलं तुलोपादीयते ... etc. The underlying assumption is that no word can be accepted as valid (साधु), unless its grammatical analysis can be demonstrated. The words *tulā* and *ya* have some external resemblance with *tulya*. Hence they are dragged in for giving derivation.

Kaiy., as usual, follows Bhar. : तुलया संमितमिति । व्युत्पत्त्यर्थमेव तुलोपादीयते । रूढिशब्दस्त्वयं सदृशपर्यायः । (On this the *Chāyā* : सदृशमात्रेत्यर्थः । " नौवयोधर्म ... ' इत्यादिना व्युत्पादनं तु साधुत्वायेति भावः ।) यथा प्रवीणः, कुशलः, प्रतिलोमः, अनुलोमः इत्यवयवार्थालाभः, एवं तुल्यशब्देऽपि. The *Kāś*. here (i. e. under P. 1. 1. 9) simply

says तुल्यशब्दः सदृशपर्यायः; under P. 4. 4. 91, however, it gives, a yet different interpretation : तुलया संमितं तुल्यम् । संमितम्=समानम्, सदृशमित्यर्थः । यथा तुला परिच्छिनत्ति परम्, एवं तद् (=तुल्यम्) अपि । In this interpretation, तुल्यः=तुलासदृशः.

[1. 2]

किं पुनरास्यम् ... etc. समुदितम्, the entire oral cavity (referred to as लौकिकमास्यम् later on in the *Mbh.*). प्रदेशान्, individual places of articulation, palate, teeth, lips etc. (in which case आस्यम्=आस्ये भवम्). — वाक्यम्=वार्त्तिकम् (the first one is meant). The *Vār.* 1 raises an objection on a particular view of *āsya*. Bhar. says that Pat. raises the question about the *āsya* here in order to introduce that *Vār.* Incidentally, there seems to be a tautology in उपन्यास and उपक्षेप.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 14) लोके विदितम्. The reference is to P. 5. 1. 43–44 : तत्र विदित इति च । लोकसर्वलोकाद् ठञ् । The word *āsya* is used in its popular sense here, like other words used in their ordinary sense in the *Aṣṭ.* e. g. *paśu* (P. 3. 2. 25 etc.), *apatya* (P. 4. 1. 92 etc.), *devatā* (P. 4. 2. 24 etc.). — Kaiy. repeats the same three examples.

काकलकम्, the top of the windpipe; popularly known as 'adam's apple'. Kaiy. defines it in almost the words of Bhar. when he says : काकलकं नाम ग्रीवाया मुन्नतप्रदेशः.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 17) कथं पुनरास्यम्. The sentence inquires about the derivation of *āsya*. The *Dīp.* एवमर्थं पृच्छति etc. elucidates the purpose behind the question. The clarification of *āsya* as ओष्ठात् प्रभृति प्राक् काकलकात् is not enough. It does not make clear whether the whole oral cavity, between the two extremes, viz. lips and adam's apple, is meant by *āsya*, or whether the individual points of articulation which occupy different parts of it are understood severally. — An objection, presupposing the futility of the knowledge of derivation of the word (केचित् ... वैयर्थ्यम्) is answered in the *Dīp.* अस्ति फलम् ... etc. This is the idea : If the word *āsya* is significant (true to the syllable), then it will apply even to individual points of articulation. If, however, it is used only in a conventional sense, say like the word *ḍittha*, then it will mean only 'mouth' in a general way. It does make a difference. Hence the utility of the question : कथं पुनरास्यम्? — निमित्त=the meanings of the constituents of a word which determine its meaning as a whole. — Kaiy. brings out this idea very briefly thus : यदि निमित्तवशात् प्रवर्तते, ततस्ताल्वादिष्वपि प्रवर्तिष्यत इति प्रश्नः.

(*p.* 27, *l.* 23) अस्यन्त्यनेन वर्णानिति etc. According to this first derivation, *āsya* is derived from *as-* 'to throw or send out' with a suffix *ya-* in the sense of a means or instrument (करणसाधनः). Bhar. does not mention the exact suffix but Kaiy. does it. According to him it is *ṇyat* (*ṇ* accounts for the Vṛddhi) taught by P. 3. 3. 113 : कृत्यल्युटो बहुलम्. The suffix *-anīya*(*r*) in *snānīyaṁ cūrṇam* is

cited as a parallel for a *kṛtya* suffix used in the sense of an instrument. — In the *Dīp.* असनमत्र. ... etc, अभिव्यक्तिः 'manifestation' is read for those who hold the view शब्दो नित्यः, while निष्पत्तिः for those who believe in शब्दः कार्यः.

वर्णानिति । अनेनासन° ... etc. The *Dīp.* says that *āsya* is not used for each and every thing which serves to throw out something. By usage the word is restricted to a particular context, viz. to convey the mouth only as serving for uttering speech sounds. It does not apply to teeth, lips etc., although they satisfy the literal meaning. Cf. Kaiy : सत्यपि निमित्ते रूढिवशात् मुख एव तत् प्रवर्तते, न ताल्वादिष्वित्यर्थः.

(*p.* 28, *l.* 1) अन्नमेतदास्यन्दत इति etc. Another derivation in which the meaning of the suffix is not an instrument, but either *kartṛ* or *karman*. Bhar. interprets this alternative derivation itself in two ways. (1) By this derivation the *Mbh.* shows that the root *as* (from which *āsya* is derived) has the meaning of *syand* here, i. e. 'to flow'. (2) *āsya* is derived from *syand-* itself thus : *ā*+*syand*+(*ḍ*)*a*. The suffix (*ḍ*)*a* (to be understood by P. 3. 2. 101 : अन्येष्वपि दृश्यते) accounts for the loss of the *ṭi* portion viz. *-and* of the stem *syand*, while the meaning of the suffix (*ḍa* in the case of *syand-*; (*ṇ*)*ya*(*t*) in the case of *as* used in the sense of *syand*) can be taken either as the कर्तृ 'agent' or as the कर्मन् object'. This refers to *āsyam* referred to by the pronoun *etad* in the *Mbh.* Thus, *āsya* can be derived in two ways (either as the agent or as the object) with the further alternative that in *āsya* you can either take the root to be *syand-*, or take the root as *as-* itself used in the sense of *syand-* : I. अन्नं (कर्तृ) एतद् (आस्यं; कर्म) (प्राप्य) अस्यति or स्यन्दते (=द्रवीभवति) '*Āsya* is that, reaching which the food is liquified'. Or, II. अन्नं (कर्म) एतत् (आस्यं; कर्तृ) अस्यति or स्यन्दते (= द्रवीकरोति) '*Āsya* is that which liquifies food'.

[1. 3]

(*p.* 28, *l.* 5) अथ कः प्रयत्नः etc. The *Dīp.* spells out the two alternatives implied : किं प्रयतनम्, अथ प्रारम्भः? we have to supply यत्नस्य before प्रारम्भः. The *Mbh.* प्रपूर्वाद् यततेर्भावसाधनो नङ् प्रत्ययः (Bhar. नशब्दः) gives the derivation : प्र+यत +न (suffix expressive of *bhāva* by P. 3. 3. 90 : यजयाचयत ··· etc.). This raises a discussion on the meaning of the word *sādhana* in the *Dīp.* भावसप्तमानि ... 'न 'शब्दवाच्यत्वेन.

An objection to the use of the expression *sādhana* in भावसाधन is implied in the *Dīp.* भावसप्तमानि कारकाणि which answers this implied objection. A *sādhana* means a *kāraka*. There are six *kāraka*-s, the *apādāna* etc., which are defined in P. 1. 4. 23 — 55. *Bhāva* is not included therein. How does the *Mbh.* then use the word भावसाधन? Bhar. first justifies it by saying that *bhāva* also is a *kāraka*, it is to be added to the list of the six *kāraka*-s. It is on this view that

Pat. uses the word भावसाधन. In the *Dīp.* अथ वा, कर्त्रादीनि... etc. Bhar. advances an alternative justification. Here the word साधन is taken in its literal sense : साधयतीति साधनः 'What brings about something'. The *kartṛ* etc. are called *sādhana = kāraka* because they bring about an activity (this product is not mentioned expressly in the *Dīp.*); *bhāva* is called *sādhana* because it also brings about special *kāraka* designations (विशिष्टाख्याप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वात्). To illustrate : A tree cannot get the designation *apādāna* unless there is the *bhāva* (activity) of the falling of a leaf from it and so on. (Cf. Kaiy. : क्रियात्र सूत्रे कारकशब्देनोच्यते। सा हि कर्त्रादीनि विशिष्टव्यपदेशयुक्तानि करोति (*Mbh.* Nirṇ. ed. 1935, *p.* 246 column 2.)

(*p.* 28, *l.* 8) एवमपि कथं भावेन ... etc. An objection against the above explanation. Let the *bhāva* be a *sādhana* for the *kāraka*-s; but how can it be a *sādhana* for the suffix *na*? Surely that suffix is not produced by the *bhāva* (कथं भावेन 'न'शब्दः साध्यते?). The *Dīp.* न साधनशब्दः ... etc. replies the objection. It says that the word *sādhana* is not to be taken in the sense of a producer (*nirvartaka*) here, but in the sense of meaning or denotation (*abhidheya*).

The *Dīp.* अथ वा भावः कैश्चित् ... etc, probably feeling that an *abhidheya* is rather a stange meaning for *sādhana* reverts to its previous position (साधन= निर्वर्तक) which, it says, is accepted by some. Here the *Dīp.* seems to say that the *bhāva* is called a *sādhana=nirvartaka* 'producer, cause (of usage)' of the suffix *na* because the meaning of the suffix *-na*, viz. *bhāva* is responsible for the use of that suffix. The suffix is used in order to convey the meaning *bhāva*. The meaning as it were prompts the suffix to be active in denoting that meaning. In the words of the *Chāyā*, the latter is the *prayojaka* of the former.

It is further meant to be said that *abhidheya* 'to be expressed, denotation' is not the meaning of *sādhana* as was said in the previous interpretation. So भावसाधनः does not mean भावाभिधेयः (भावः अभिधेयः अस्य) or भाववाची. (It is really the suffix *-na* which is भावाभिधेय or भाववाची.) The suffix *na* is called भावसाधन because the *bhāva* is responsible for the coming into being or the use of that suffix.

One cannot help feeling that Bhar. has here made things unnecessarily confused and brought in things like the *siddha bhāva* and the other *bhāva* (see below) which are not pertinent here. Contrast this with the explanation given by Kaiy. which is very clear, brief and to the point : भावसाधन इति। भावेऽभिधेये नङ् प्रत्ययः क्रियते। तेन नङ्शब्दस्य भावः साधनं भवति। Nāg. supplies tbe background to facilitate understanding of this remark thus ; ननु साधनशब्देन कारकशक्तिरभिधीयत इति भावस्य साधनत्वमनुपपन्नमत आह — भावे इति।

(*p.* 28, *l*, 10) अभ्यन्तरो भावोऽपि ... etc. This *Dīp.* makes a distinction between a *bhāva* (activity) which is in process and a finished *bhāva* (verbal

abstract). A verbal root (प्रकृतिः, e. g. *pac-* in *pāka*) expresses the activity in process while the suffix (e. g. *ghañ*) expresses its finished state. A *bhāva* in process, which has not found itself fully, which cannot be named or pointed out as being such and such (न शक्यो व्यपदेष्टम्), cannot bring about something else. It is only the finished (*siddha-*) *bhāva* which can do so. So only this latter is to be understood by *bhāva* in the *Mbh.* : प्रपूर्वाद् यततेर्भावसाधनो नशब्दः.

As a parallel to the *bhedābheda* between the two *bhāvas* (one expressed by the verbal root and the other by the suffix), Bhar. adduces the example of the word *vānaspatya* 'a collection of plants'. The stem (*vanaspati*) means the plants individually, while the suffix (*ṇya*; P. 4. 1. 85, *Vār*. 10 : II. 237. 15) means 'the collection'. Ultimately the thing meant is the same. — स च भावः क्वचित् ... etc. The phrase क्वचित् केनचित् धर्मेण रूढः probably means : क्वचित् साध्यरूपेण, क्वचित् सिद्धरूपेण. The word संबन्धित्वेन is here practically equivalent to साधनत्वेन. The *bhāva* is the meaning (*vācya*) of the suffix *-na* and so it is looked upon as संबन्धिन्=साधन=निर्वर्तक of that suffix (भावसाधनः नशब्दः as the *Mbh.* says).

[1.4]

(*p.* 28, *l.* 15) किमास्योपादान इति. The *Mbh.* indicated by this *pratīka* runs thus: यदि लौकिकमास्यम्, किमास्योपादाने प्रयोजनम्? सर्वेषां हि तत् समानम्। The *Mbh.* has reverted to the *āsya*. It was told that by *āsya* the mouth, which is popularly known, is to be understood. So now the question is asked: Since the mouth is a common place of articulation for all the phonemes, how can it be useful in differentiating sounds which can be *savarṇa* and those which cannot?

(*p.* 28, *l.* 15) नासिकायामपि वर्णा निष्पाद्यन्ते ... Here an attempt is made to show some utility of reading the word *āsya-* in the Sū. even on the view that it is used in the popular sense. It will serve to exclude sounds produced in the nose from being *savarṇa*. — उच्यते। आस्य एव ते ... etc. rejects this possibility. An attempt is made to show that the sounds which are stated to be produced in the nose are really produced in the mouth itself. To this end two interpretations of *nāsikā* are advanced in the *Dīp*. One view (एकं दर्शनम्) is that the *nāsikā* here means अनुनासमात्रम्. What this means is not clear. The word अनुनास is not usual. Relying on its derivative meaning, अनुनासमात्रम् could be inferred to mean 'just close (*anu*) to the nose'. It could be that part of the oral cavity which is close to the nasal passage. According to another view quoted in the *Dīp.*, by *nāsikā* is not to be understood the popularly understood external (*iyam*) nose. *Nāsikā* here means a nerve (? रेखा) which is connected with a *carmapuṭaka* (cup-shaped skin ?) which is stretched like the hide of a drum, and is situated within the mouth. It is this nerve which, when struck by the breath, produces the nasal twang. Anyway the nasal sounds are produced

in the mouth itself on this view and so the utility of the *āsya*, if understood in the popular sense, remains doubtful.

The objection remains unanswered in the *Dīp.*

Kaiy. has repeated the *Dīp.*, dropping only the अनुनासमात्रम् view. Read : नासिकापि न बाह्या वर्णोत्पत्तिनिमित्तम्। किं तर्हि? आस्यान्तश्चर्म विततमस्ति, पणवचर्मवत्, तत्संबद्धा रेखा नासिका। तस्यां वाय्वभिघाताद् वर्णोत्पत्तिः।

(*p.* 28, *l.* 20) अकारस्य बाह्यं स्थानम् ... etc. Two phonemes still remain, viz. (1) *a* (whose place is *kaṇṭha*) and (2) Visarga (whose place is *uras* according to some) which are not produced in the mouth. The *Dīp.* says that a discussion about *a* will take place later (*p.* 29, *l.* 8 ff). As to the Visarga, it has no use for the designation *savarṇa*. — वक्ष्यत्येतदयम् ... etc. This is the reply to the objection taken above : यदि लौकिकमास्यं किमास्योपादाने प्रयोजनम्? The *Dīp.* points out that just now it is not convenient to discuss this. It will be made clear later on (under *Vār.* 2) that the *āsya* is meant for qualifying *prayatna.*

Readings : (1) (*p.* 27, *l.* 2) MS -ग्रहणेयः; ALSw °णे च. — (2) (*p.* 27, *l.* 2) Following Sw, we add गुरु after शास्त्रं.—(3) (*p.* 27, *l.* 3) MSSw च त्यास्तुत-; AL कथं श्रुत-. — (4) (*p.* 27, *l.* 3) AL अदृष्टार्थे. — MS द्यातः. Sw योतृघातः (?) (for योऽदृष्टार्थे स्वरूपग्रहणे). — (5) (*p.* 27, *l.* 6) AL Sw -कल्पनया- — (6) (*p.* 27, *l.* 6) MS तत्तुयुक्तं; AL तत्त्व°; Sw तन्न युक्तं. — (7) (*p.* 27, *l.* 7) MS सदृश- — (8) (*p.* 27, *l.* 8) ALSw -संबन्धात् (for °न्धादि). — (9) (*p.* 27, *l.* 9) Sw -सदृक्ष- (for -सदृक्). — (10) (*p.* 27, *l.* 9) MS तु नोपा° (for तुलोपा°). — (11) (*p.* 27, *l.* 10) MSSw संमितव्यम्. — (12) (*p* 27, *l.* 13) Sw एव (for एवम्). — (13) (*p.* 27, *l.* 17) ALSw एतमर्थं. — (13A) (*p.* 27, *l.* 19) ALSw चोदयन्ति. — (14) (*p.* 27, *l.* 19) MS यत्नाभावात् (for फला°). — (15) (*p.* 27, *l.* 20) Sw -प्रश्नावै°. — (16) (*p.* 27, *l.* 21) MSSw स्वरूपनिमित्ता°. — We read यदि after स्वरूपम्, taking स्वरूपम् as a part of the previous sentence against older eds. — (17) (*p.* 27, *l.* 23) MS अस्यति. — (18) (*p.* 27, *l.* 25) Sw °भिप्रेतो वर्णा(ना)मिति. — (19) (*p.* 28, *l.* 1) Sw (following the sequence in the *Mbh.* ed.) इति वा श्वास्यम्. — (20) (*p.* 28, *l.* 1) MS स्यदेवार्थे; AL स्यन्दनार्थे; Sw स्यदेश्वार्थे. — (21) (*p.* 28, *l.* 2) AL स्यन्देर् (for स्यदि-). — (22) (*p.* 28, *l.* 4) MSAL एनदङ्गं. — (23) (*p.* 28, *l.* 6) *Mbh.* ed. नञ् प्रत्ययः (for नशब्दः). — (24) (*p.* 28, *l.* 6) MSAL भाव- (for भावः). — (25) (*p.* 28, *l.* 7) MSSw om. ऽपि.—(25A) (*p.* 28, *l.* 8) AL भावेसाधनशब्दः (for भावेन नशब्दः). — (26) (*p.* 28, *l.* 9) MS निवर्तकार्थः. — (27) (*p.* 28, *l.* 10) For ऽपि प्रकृतो of MS and the eds. we suggest हि प्रकृत्यर्थो. — (28) (*p.* 28, *l.* 12) The MS seems to have dropped one भेदा hapl. — (29) (*p* 28, *l.* 14) ALSw न शब्द- (for 'न 'शब्द-). — (30) (*p.* 28, *l.* 16) AL तुलासमाऽत्र (for ऽनुनासमात्रं). — (31) (*p.* 28, *l.* 18) MS ति (for ऽस्ति). — (32) (*p.* 28, *l.* 18) MS AL Sw add इति after °पुटकम्. —

(33) (*p*. 28, *l*. 21) अयं not read in the *Mbh*. ed. — AL वक्ष्यत्येतत्। प्रयत्नवि°; Sw वक्ष्य(त्ये)तत् — (प्र)य(त्न)वि°.

[2]

The *Vār*. 1 : सवर्णसंज्ञायां भिन्नदेशेष्वतिप्रसङ्गः प्रयत्नसामान्यात्। raises an objection against the definition of *savarṇa* given in the Sū. The *Mbh*. on this *Vār*. runs as follows : सवर्णसंज्ञायां भिन्नदेशेष्वतिप्रसङ्गो भवति। जबगडदशाम्। किं कारणम्? प्रयत्नसामान्यात्। एतेषां हि समानः प्रयत्नः। It is pointed out that the way the Sū. is worded, even phonemes with different points of articulation, say *j*, *b* ... etc. will have to be termed *savarṇa* which is not desired.

There are two assumptions behind the objection : (1) *āsyaprayatna* is a Dvandva compound, (2) *āsya* has the popular meaning viz. 'mouth'. In the case of *j*, *b*, *g* etc., all of them have mouth as a place of articulation and also a common effort, viz. *spṛṣṭatā* 'close contact'. As a result they get the name *savarṇa* undesiredly (in spite of their different points of articulation).

The defect, then, in the definition is that it does not mention the sameness of the specific point of articulation as a condition for *sāvarṇya*. But this point does not seem to have been clearly stated in the *Dīp*. Bhar. merely says : न हि द्वंद्वे शक्यत आस्येन प्रयत्नो विशेषयितुम् इति ..., as though the difficulty stemmed only from the compound being regarded as a Dvandva. No. The difficulty would still persist even if a three-constituent Bahuvrīhi is admitted (येषाम् आस्ये तुल्यः प्रयत्नः), thus qualifying *prayatna* by *āsya*, unless and until आस्य is understood as a Taddhita formation meaning 'a specific point of articulation in the mouth'. The effort at a particular point of articulation will *imply* that the phonemes concerned have a common point of articulation also. If, however, *āsya* continues to have its popular meaning, then no purpose is served even if the qualification of effort by *āsya* is achieved by a *tripada* Bahuvrīhi. (On the other hand, the desired meaning can be had without any undesired result even from a Dvandva compound, provided the word *āsya* is understood as a Taddhita form.)

Kaiy. follows Bhar. and similarly says द्वंद्वे प्रयत्नस्यास्येनाविशेषणान्मुखप्रयत्नयोस्तुल्यत्वाद् भिन्नस्थानानामपि प्रसङ्गः। Here Nāg. also finds fault with द्वंद्वे प्रयत्नस्यास्येनाविशेषणात् and remarks : ... अस्योपयोगश्चिन्त्यः.

(*p*. 28, *l*. 25) अन्तर्वर्ती=आभ्यन्तरः. करणम्, although strictly this should mean the mobile organ (like a particular part of the tongue), here it is used in the sense of *prayatna*. See also below (*p*. 29, *l*. 24) the *Mbh*. : आस्ये भवमास्यम्। किं पुनरास्ये भवम्? स्थानं करणं च। On this the *Dīp*. : करणं केषांचित् स्पृष्टतादि, केषांचित् जिह्वाया अग्रोपाग्रमध्यमूलानि.

In the three words तर्प्ता 'he is going to be satisfied', ऊर्ज्जः 'born from food', and ऊर्ज्ज्यः 'present in what is born of food' the *jhar* consonants *p* and *g* are preceded by a consonant *r* and followed by a (on this definition) *savarṇa jhar*, *t* in the first example and *j* in the remaining two. So, *p* and *g* will have to be optionally deleted according to P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे.

[2. 1]

The *Vār*. 2 suggests a reframing of the Sū. as : आस्ये तुल्यदेशप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्. This wording will require both a common point and the effort to be in the mouth. Then there will be no undesired result of the name *savarṇa* for *j*, *b*, *g* etc. (संज्ञा न भविष्यति). Cf. Nāg. : देशपदेन ताल्वादिस्थानमेवोच्यते इति जबगडादिषु न दोषः.

(*p*. 29, *l*. 2) एवमपि किमास्योपादाने ... etc. The *Mbh*. adds : सर्वेषां हि तत्तुल्यम् in order to justify the question. *Āsya* (in the general sense 'mouth' : ओष्ठात् प्रभृति प्राक् काकलकात् as explained in the *Mbh*. before) is common to all phonemes. How can then this new form in which the Sū. is presented help in mentioning common properties (not found in some others) which are necessary for the application of the name *savarṇa*? Cf. Kaiy. तत्र व्यभिचाराभावादास्येन देशस्य विशेषणमयुक्तमित्यर्थः।

(*p*. 29, *l*. 3) प्रयत्नविशेषणमिति. In the *Mbh*. this is followed by : सन्ति ह्यास्याद् बाह्याः प्रयत्नाः। ते ह्यपिता भवन्ति। तेषु सत्स्वसत्स्वपि सवर्णसंज्ञा सिद्धा भवति. The *Mbh*. clarifies by saying that *āsye* is meant to qualify *prayatna*, not *deśa*. The efforts to be considered while deciding on *sāvarṇya* are those which are in the mouth — आस्ये प्रयत्नः = आस्यान्तर्वर्ती as the *Dīp*. says. This shows that it does not matter whether the external *prayatna*-s are similar or not.

(*p*. 29, *l*. 4) वर्ग्यो वर्ग्येण ... etc. This illustrates the purpose of restricting the *prayatna*-s to internal efforts in this matter. The phoneme *k*, for instance, is desired to be 'homogeneous' with *kh*. The internal effort, viz. *spṛṣṭatā* is common to the two. So also the point of articulation, viz. *kaṇṭha*. So we get the desired name *savarṇa*. If, however, the external efforts also were included, then the two cannot he called *savarṇa*, since *k* is *alpaprāṇa* while *kh* is *mahāprāṇa*. That is why only the four internal efforts (viz. स्पृष्टता, ईषत्स्पृष्टता, विवृतता, and संवृतता) are considered. The external efforts are not considered. This is possible by making *āsya* a qualification of *prayatna* (तस्मादास्य ... व्युदस्यन्ते).

(*p*. 29, *l*. 7) संवारविवाराविति. (The *Mbh*. reads विवारसंवारौ). Here follows in the *Mbh*. a full list of the external efforts and also their application to individual consonants thus : विवारसंवारौ, श्वासनादौ, घोषवदघोषता, अल्पप्राणतामहाप्राणतेति। तत्र वर्गाणां प्रथमद्वितीया विवृतकण्ठाः, श्वासानुप्रदानाः, अघोषाश्च। एकेऽल्पप्राणाः,

अपरे महाप्राणाः । तृतीयचतुर्थाः संवृतकण्ठाः, नादानुप्रदानाः, घोषवन्तः । एकेऽल्पप्राणाः, अपरे महाप्राणाः । यथा तृतीयास्तथा पञ्चमाः, आनुनासिक्यवर्जम् । आनुनासिक्यमेषामधिको गुणः । Later the three pitches, Udātta, Anudātta and Svarita also came to be counted among the external efforts.

[2. 2]

एवमप्यवर्णस्य ... etc. An objection against प्रयत्नविशेषणमास्योपादानम्. एवमपि = बाह्यप्रयत्नवारणायास्यग्रहणस्य प्रयत्नविशेषणत्वेऽपि (*Chāyā*). The *Dīp.* (followed by Kaiy.) fixes the point below the Adam's apple near the collar-bone as the point of articulation of *a*. Since the Adam's apple, as said above, forms the (lower) end of the *āsya*, the phoneme *a* does not have its point of articulation in the *āsya*. How can then *a* be *savarṇa* with, say, *ā* ?

(*p.* 29, *l.* 10) ननु चास्यग्रहणं ... etc. A pertinent objection. It was said above that *āsya* is meant for qualifying *prayatna*. And the *prayatna* of *a* is in the *āsya* (अन्तर्वर्ती). Why do you now deny *sāvarṇya* for *a* on the ground that its place (and not *prayatna*) is not in the *āsya* ? — एवं मन्यते ... etc. replies this objection. If the place or point of articulation is outside the *āsya*, the *prayatna* also has to be perforce admitted as being outside the *āsya*. An inner *prayatna* and an outside place do not go together. In the absence of inner effort how can there be *sāvarṇya* ?

An alternative reply is given in अथ वा स्थान ... etc. Since the place of articulation of *a* is outside, one can connect *āsya* in the definition with *sthāna* also to qualify it. And if *a* does not have a place in the *āsya*, how can there be *sāvarṇya* for *a* ? So there is nothing wrong in the objection अवर्णस्य न प्राप्नोति.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 13) सर्वमुखस्थानम् ... etc. Having clarified the objections against the *Mbh.* एवमप्यवर्णस्य सवर्णसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति, the *Dīp.* now introduces the *Mbh.* which replies it. According to some *śikṣā* treatise, the entire mouth (apparently including the region काकलकस्याधस्तादुपजत्रु) is the place of articulation of *a*. The whole mouth is active in the utterance of *a*. So one cannot say : बाह्यं ह्यास्यात् स्थानमवर्णस्य.

The *Dīp.* भिन्नस्थानत्वात् नास्ति ... etc. points out an incidental advantage of the सर्वमुखस्थानम् अवर्णम् view. On this view *a* and *h* have different places of articulation : *a* has *sarvamukha* while *h* has *kaṇṭha*. Since there is no *tulyasthānatā*, there is no possibility of their *sāvarṇya* becoming due undesiredly. So the rule *nājjhalau* (P. 1. 1. 10) becomes unnecessary as far as *a* and *h* are concerned.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 16) एवमपि व्यपदेशो ... etc. एवमपि = अवर्णस्य सर्वमुखस्थानकत्वेऽपि. An objection is raised here : The revised definition reads : आस्ये येषां तुल्यो देशः.

'The *deśa* in the *āsya*' implies that the two are different. *Āsya* is one thing; it is *adhikaraṇa* or *ādhāra*. *Deśa* is another thing; it is *ādheya*. But when you subscribe to the view सर्वमुखस्थानम् अवर्णम् the two become one. The *deśa*, viz. सर्वमुखम् becomes identical with *āsya* (the *adhikaraṇa*). When there is thus identity, how can you use one in Locative (*āsye*) and the other in Nominative (*deśaḥ*)? This wording is unreasonable.

आधेयत्वेन वाधिकरणत्वेन वा. What other (i. e. other than itself) *ādheya* the *āsya* can have and what other *adhikaraṇa* the *deśa* can have?

(*p.* 29, *l.* 18) व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन व्यपदेशो भविष्यति. A usual solution in such cases. Although *āsya* as a whole is one, a differentiation is made in it by assuming a part-and-whole relationship (समुदायावयवकल्पनया भेदः क्रियते). This is how it is done: The mouth as substratum of the articulation of all phonemes is considered as a whole and that part of the mouth which concerns the articulation of *a* is considered as the part. Thus the whole is the *adhikaraṇa* and the region of *a* is the *ādheya*. That is how the wording आस्ये येषां तुल्यो देशः can be accounted for. Incidentally, the reason for using two separate expressions: वर्णान्तरविषयम् and उत्पादनक्रियाविषयम् is not easy to see. It seems that a single expression वर्णान्तरोत्पादनक्रियाविषयम् would have done.

अथ वा, शब्द एव (*l.* 20) ... etc. provides an alternative explanation. It apparently invokes the doctrine: अर्थभेदेन शब्दभेदः. There is no one *āsya* word. There are more than one. One of the *āsya* words conveys a general meaning, mouth in general, i. e. the *adhikaraṇa* in the present case. The other conveys a a specific meaning, e. g. the point of articulation of *a* in our example. Since we thus have two entities, the *adhikaraṇa-ādheya* relation is possible. So one can reasonably say: आस्ये येषां तुल्यो देशः.

[2. 3]

न हि लौकिकमास्यम्. When the wording आस्ये येषां तुल्यो देशः is thus justified the question comes up whether the Sū. is to be accepted in this modified form. The *Mbh.* then pleads that although this revised Sū. meets our requirements, we have no right to amend the Sū. As to the difficulty pointed out in the *Vār.* 1 viz. भिन्नदेशेष्वतिप्रसङ्गः, the *Mbh.* now proposes a different remedy. Instead of taking *āsya* in the popular sense, it is now proposed that that word be understood in a technical sense: आस्ये भवम् आस्यम् (आस्य + the Taddhita suffix *-ya* in the sense of 'what is there' (P. 4. 3. 55), this suffix being subsequently dropped by P. 8. 4. 64), i. e. any specific point of articulation, like *tālu*, *oṣṭhau* etc. Read the *Mbh.*: व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन व्यपदेशो भविष्यति। सिध्यति। सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते। यथान्यासमेवास्तु। ननु चोक्तम् 'सवर्णसंज्ञायां भिन्नदेशेष्वतिप्रसङ्गः प्रयत्नसामान्यात्' इति। नैष दोषः। न हि लौकिकमास्यम्। किं तर्हि? तद्धितान्तमास्यम्। शरीरावयवाद्यत्।

(*p.* 29, *l.* 22) ननु च तद्धितान्तमपि ... etc. An objection to the *Mbh.* statement that here the *āsya*, which is to be understood, is not *laukika*, but *taddhitānta*. The objector says that a *taddhitānta āsya* (*āsya*+*ya*=*āsya*) is as much *laukika*, i. e. popularly known, as the simple *āsya* (√*as*+[*n*]*ya*[*t*]). So *āsya* ending in a Taddhita suffix will have to be equally ruled out. — एतदाचष्टे ... etc. replies this objection. True. All that is meant is that *āsya*, the primary noun formed with (*ṇ*)*ya*(*t*), is not to be understood here; it is the secondary noun which is formed from it with the addition of the Taddhita suffix *ya*(*t*) that is meant here. — यस्य श्रुत्वा समधिगमः क्रियते 'what is understood by mere hearing' as against the तद्धितान्त which requires an explanation. Kaiy. echoes Bhar.: यद्यपि ताल्वादिकमपि लौकिकमास्यं तथापि तत्र योगवशादास्यशब्दो वर्तत इति झटिति (= पदश्रवणमात्रेण Nāg.) न तत् प्रसिद्धम्. Incidentally, Nāg. understands वैदिकम् as the opposite of लौकिकम्, but that does not seem to be intended by Pat.

स्थानं करणं च (*l.* 24). The *Mbh.* quoted just above (which ends in शरीरावयवाद्यत्) is immediately followed by the two sentences: किं पुनरास्ये भवम्? स्थानं करणं च. So, according to this *Mbh.* a common place of articultation and a common *karaṇa* are necessary for *sāvarṇya*.

In स्थानं ताल्वादि ... etc. Bhar. explains the two terms. Since तद्धितान्तमास्यम् is now accepted, so स्थानं ताल्वादि. The *Dīp.* gives two alternative explanations of *karaṇa* given by two different authorities. Since स्थान is usually understood in the sense of the immobile organ, *karaṇa* naturally should mean the mobile organ, i. e. the tongue with its various parts. The meaning 'effort' or the manner of articulation (like the स्पृष्टता) is only a meaning which can be called *pāribhāṣika*, i. e. current in some particular school.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 25) यद्येवम्, किमर्थं ... etc. A legitimate question. प्रत्येकं व्यापारव्युदासार्थम् is the reply. If only *āsya*- is mentioned in the Sū., it will be misunderstood. It will be perhaps thought that here तुल्यस्थानता (or mere तुल्यप्रयत्नता also) suffices.[1] So to make doubly sure *prayatna* also is included in the definition. Otherwise the same defect will appear once more, which was earlier mentioned in the case of *j*, *b*, *g* etc.

The sentence यथैव स्थानं स्थानान्तरनिरपेक्षं स्यात् is not clear.

(*p.* 29, *l.* 28) एवमपि प्रयत्न ... etc. Even so (एवमपि=तद्धितान्तास्यशब्दाश्रयणेऽपि) the *prayatna* remains unqualified by *āsya*, because so far we are

1. Nāg. shows another possibility. If everything which is आस्ये भवम् is to be considered for *sāvarṇya*, it will lead to over-extension. For even conjunctions of wind find themselves in the *āsya*. The reading of *prayatna* in the Sū. serves to restrict the denotation of *āsya* to 'place of articulation'. Read: प्रयत्नपदमास्यपदेन स्थानमात्रग्रहणार्थम्। 'स्थानं करणं च' इति भाष्ये करणपदेन वायुसंयोगोऽपि। प्रयत्नग्रहणाच्च नातिप्रसङ्ग इति तात्पर्यम्।

looking upon *āsyaprayatna* as a Dvandva. As the *Dīp.* explains, in that case the agreement between external efforts also will be necessary for *sāvarṇya*. And so *k* and *kh*, for example, will not be regarded as homogeneous undesiredly. The exclusion of external efforts is not yet achieved.

[2. 4]

प्रयत्नश्च विशेषितः ... etc. The full *Mbh.* runs thus: प्रयत्नश्च विशेषितः। कथम्? न हि प्रयतनं प्रयत्नः। किं तर्हि? प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य प्रयत्नः. Here Pat. gives up the view: प्रयतनं प्रयत्नः and takes up the other view: प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य प्रयत्नः for trial, so as to arrive ultimately at internal efforts. *Prayatna*, according to this interpretation, literally means 'the initial effort'. As the *spṛṣṭatā* etc. (usually known as an आभ्यन्तर or internal effort) come into force first, they are referred to by the word *prayatna* in the Sū.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 3) एतद्बाह्यकारस्य दर्शनम् ... etc. Pat. does not say expressly why he regards *spṛṣṭatā* as an inner effort. So Bhar. tries to clarify the view held by Pat. He says that according to Pat. the contact (whether partial or whole) of the tongue with the point of articulation, or of the two lips etc., takes place first. The external efforts like *vivāra* (which concerns the outgoing breath) take place after it has struck the roof of the mouth. Since neither Pat. nor Bhar. gives the complete theory, it is difficult to say anything about it. According to the modern theory, however, the qualities like 'voice' (*ghoṣa*) already come in while the breath is passing out of the vocal chords (the term *vivāra* 'opening' should rather refer to the slit between the vocal chords) while the contacts between the fixed and the mobile organs (*sthāna* and *karaṇa*) take place at almost the last stage. (In the theory attributed to Pat., the *ābhyantara* efforts become active before the production of the speech sound; the *bāhya* efforts operate subsequent to it.)

Incidentally, Nāg. explains प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य thus: अत्र यत्नस्येति निर्धारणे षष्ठी। जातौ चैकवचनम्। आरम्भ इति कर्मणि घञ्। यत्नानां मध्ये प्रथमं वर्णोत्पत्तेः पूर्वमारभ्यमाण इत्यर्थः।

(*p*. 30, *l*. 6) प्रश्लिष्टाववर्णावेतौ. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.*: यदि प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य प्रयत्नः, एवमप्यवर्णस्य एङोश्च सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति. An objection is raised here. Irrespective of what is understood by *prayatna*, here is a problem, viz. there is an undesired possibility of *a* getting *sāvarṇya* with *e* and *o*. The first constituent of both is *a*. So by the rule तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम् *e*/*o* will have to be accepted as *savarṇa* with *a*. This is the problem.

The *Mbh.* प्रश्लिष्टावर्णावेतौ replies the objection. The constituents *a*+*i* and *a*+*u* are so completely blended together in *e* and *o* respectively that *a* cannot be separated from them. How can something be called *savarṇa* with something

when the latter cannot be shown to have a separate existence? The *Dīp.* says that *a* in *e* and *o* is as indistinguishable from *i* and *u* as a drop of milk in a jar of water.

According to another opinion quoted in the *Dīp.* प्रश्लिष्ट is here equivalent to संवृत. Since there is difference of effort (*a* is *vivṛta* in grammar, although *saṁvṛta* in practice), there will be no *sāvarṇya*.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 8) अवर्णस्य तर्हि, ऐचोश्चेति. सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति is the remaining part of this sentence in the *Mbh.* In *e/o*, the first part *a* was *praśliṣṭa* but not so in *ai* and *au*. Here *a* is विश्लिष्ट as Bhar. says (विभागोऽत्र सुलभः Kaiy.). So *sāvarṇya* forces itself here. If one asks what harm is there, तत्र नाव्यं etc. is the reply.

नाव्यम् is formed from नौ+यत् in the sense of नावा तार्यम् by P. 4. 4. 91: नौवयोधर्म ... etc. The vowel *au* of the stem is replaced by *āv* (P. 6. 1. 79: वान्तो यि प्रत्यये). If, however, there is *sāvarṇya* between the independent *a* and the *a* of *ai/au*, then the latter *a* also will be understood (P. 1. 1. 69: अणुदित् सवर्णस्य ... etc.) from *a* uttered in P. 6. 4. 148: यस्येति च. The result will be that *a* (of *nau*) will have to be dropped.

नौभूतम् is an example of *cvi* (P. 5. 4. 50). When this *cvi* (which is subsequently to be dropped, P. 6. 1. 67) follows, *a* (of *nau*) will have to be replaced by *ī* (P. 7. 4. 32), which is not desired. (ईत्वं च स्यात् as the *Dīp.* says.)

नौयति is formed from नौ with the suffix क्यच् (=य) in the sense of नावमात्मनः इच्छति by P. 3. 1. 8: सुप आत्मनः क्यच्. If *a* (of *nau*) is to have *sāvarṇya* with the independent *a*, then it will have to be replaced by *ī* (P. 7. 4. 33: क्यचि च) resulting into an undesired form.

In the three forms, elision (of *a*) pertains to the first while the *ī*-substitution pertains to the other two. Incidentally, Kaiy. mentions only the case of *nāvyam*.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 10) एतयोरेव तर्हि मिथः. Here also सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति is the unquoted part of the *Mbh.* sentence. Bhar. explains एतयोः by ऐकारौकारयोः. (Before this, the *Mbh.* refutes the objection regarding *nāvyam* etc. on the ground of the absence of *sāvarṇya*. The independent *a* is just *vivṛta*, while the one in *ai/au* is *vivṛtatara*.) Since the *sthāna-prayatna*-s of *au* are the same as those of *ai*, *sāvarṇya* will result.

किं पुनः स्यात् 'what harm is there'? — asks the opponent. 'एत ऐ' ... etc. cites an example where a wrong form will result. When *loṭ* (Imperative) follows, the ending *e* (1st sing., Ātmane) is replaced by *ai*. With *sāvarṇya* between *ai* and *au*, even *au* can substitute *e*. This argument is quietly refuted by pointing out that what is mentioned as a predicate (*bhāvyamāna* 'what is

being produced', i. e. taught as coming in) has no power of *savarṇa-grahaṇa* (Pari. 19). In the *Mbh.*, however, the objection is refuted on the ground that there is no *sāvarṇya* because of difference in the place of articulation.

(*p.* 30, *l.* 13) अभेदका उदात्तादयः. This is a reply to an objection which reads thus in the *Mbh.*: उदात्तादीनां तर्हि सवर्णसंज्ञा न प्राप्नोति. The effort necessary for uttering a vowel with a different accent is also आस्ये भवः. If the totality of efforts in the *āsya* is regarded as necessary for *sāvarṇya*, then an Udātta *a* will not be homogeneous with an Anudātta *a*. 'Udātta etc. are not distinctive' replies the *Mbh.* They do not make a difference in this respect. Even vowels with a different accent can be homogeneous, if they satisfy other conditions.

Are the accents Udātta etc. excluded on the ground that they belong to the external efforts? It is to be remembered that they are not included in the external efforts (विवार, श्वास etc.) listed in the *Mbh.* (see above 2. 1). Besides, the *Chāyā* positively calls them *ābhyantara*. Read: उदात्तादिजनकयत्नस्याभ्यन्तरकार्यकरत्वेन तेषामाभ्यन्तरत्वादिति भावः. However, they are not included in the *ābhyantara yatna*-s in the *Mbh.* on P. 1. 1. 10 *Vār* 3 (I. 64. 7-10). In the tradition they are usually regarded as *bāhya prayatna.*

But how is it known that उदात्त etc. are अभेदक? The *Dīp.* प्रतिपादितं लिङ्गात् ... etc. is the reply. When Pāṇini teaches the prefixion of an Udātta *a*(*ṭ*) to the verb in a preterite form, he does not *utter* that *a*(*ṭ*) as Udātta, he just *describes* it by the word 'Udātta' itself, cf. P. 6. 4. 71; लुङ्लङ्लृङ्क्ष्वडुदात्तः.

यत् समानं तदाश्रयिष्यामः. After stating that the Udātta etc. are non-distinctive (अभेदकाः), the *Mbh.* shifts its position once more and says that *prayatna* is just equivalent to 'effort in general' (*prayatanan*) — so no more प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य — but in the matter of *sthāna* it sticks to its position: तद्धितान्तमास्यम्. Read: अथ वा, किं न एतेन — प्रारम्भो यत्नस्य प्रयत्न इति? प्रयतनमेव प्रयत्नः। तदेव च तद्धितान्तमास्यम्। यत् समानं तदाश्रयिष्यामः।

The *Dīp.* प्रथमद्वितीययोः ... etc. points out that the arrangement is satisfactory. Although there is difference of external efforts between, e. g. *k* and *kh*, and between *g* and *gh* (the former in both the pairs is unaspirate, the latter aspirate)[1], still we shall rely on the common effort viz. *spṛṣṭatā*. So there will be no difficulty in ensuring *sāvarṇya* among all the four. Cf. Kaiy.: स्पृष्टत्वस्य समानत्वाद् वर्ग्याणां बाह्यप्रयत्नभेदेऽपि सवर्णसंज्ञा भविष्यति.

So there is no harm even if *prayatna* is not qualified.

1. In fact there is a difference of external effort between not only *k* and *kh* and between *g* and *gh*, but between all the four. None has completely identical external effort with any other.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 17) किं सति भेदे ? The opponent is surprised. His apprehension is expressed in the *Dīp*. यदि विवारादीनां भेदे ... etc.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 18) यदि हि यत्र सर्वं समानमिति. The question किं सति भेदे ? is thus answered emphatically in the *Mbh.* : सतीत्याह। सत्येव हि भेदे सवर्णसंज्ञया भवितव्यम्। कुत एतत्? भेदाधिष्ठाना हि सवर्णसंज्ञा। यदि हि यत्र सर्वं समानं तत्र स्यात् सवर्णसंज्ञावचनमनर्थकं स्यात्।

Observation : Bhar. (followed by Kaiy. and Nāg.) explains the *Mbh.* expression सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम् differently from what looks like a natural explanation. We first give Bhar.'s explanation.

I. the expression सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम् means the reading of the word *savarṇa* (as a condition for the following speech sound) in rules like P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः and P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे. The *Mbh.* says that if by *sāvarṇya* a hundred per cent identity of place and efforts were intended, then the reading of *savarṇa* in the two above rules will not be of any use (अनर्थकं स्यात्). The *Dīp.* illustrates this by taking the example of forms like *śiṇḍhi* (Imper. 2. sing. Parasmai) from शिनष्+धि. At the final stage शिण्ड्+ढि the two consonants *ḍ* and *ḍh* are not *savarṇa* (on the view : यत्र सर्वं समानं तत्र सवर्णसंज्ञा) because *ḍh* is *mahāprāṇa* (aspirate) and *ḍ* is not. And so the elision of *ḍ* will be no longer available by the rule झरो झरि सवर्णे. The reading of *savarṇa* will be useless as far as forms like *śiṇḍhi* are concerned. This indicates that Pāṇini means भेदे सत्येव सवर्णसंज्ञा.

Incidentally, the process of arriving at the forms *śiṇḍhi* and *piṇḍhi* is given in the *Padam.* (under P. 8. 4. 65). Read : 'शिष्लृ विशेषणे', 'पिष्लृ संचूर्णने'। रुधादी। लोट्। सेर्हिः। 'श्नसोरल्लोपः। हेर्धिः। 'झलां जश् झशि' इति षकारस्य डकारः। 'नश्चापदान्तस्य झलि' इत्यनुस्वारः। तस्य परसवर्णो णकारः। धकारस्य ष्टुत्वम्, ढकारः। अनेन डकारस्य ढकारे लोपः।

The progress of the desired form may be shown thus :

शिष् + लोट् (P. 3. 3. 162)
शिनष् + हि (P. 3. 1. 78; 3. 4. 87)
शिन्ष् + हि (P. 6. 4. 111)
शिन्ष् + धि (P. 6. 4. 101)
शिन्ड् + धि (P. 8. 4. 53)
शिंड् + धि (P. 8. 3. 24)
शिण्ड् + धि (P. 8. 4. 58)
शिण्ड् + ढि (P. 8. 4. 41)
शिण्O + ढि (P. 8. 4. 65)
शिण्ढि.

II. We have given above the interpretation of सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम् following Bhar.[1] But that does not seem to be natural. If Pat. had intended to express the idea which Bhar. ascribes to him, he would have said सवर्णग्रहणम् 'reading of the word *savarṇa*' (in rules P. 6. 1. 101; 8. 4. 65) and not सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम्. The expression सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम् should in all naturalness mean 'teaching of the name *savarṇa* (in P. 1. 1. 9)'. The idea seems to be that since a hundred per cent uniformity of *prayatna* is impossible to have (in that case the two phonemes will have to be *identical*, not just *similar*: see the *Śabdakaustubha* quoted below), the coining of the term will be useless. Many operations based on *sāvarṇya* will become impossible. Pāṇini would not have used the term at all. If Pāṇini's procedure is to have any meaning, we must take it that यत्र सर्वं समानं तत्र सवर्णसंज्ञा was not Pāṇini's idea.

Pat.'s statement is not clear in one respect. When he says: यदि हि यत्र सर्वं समानं ... अनर्थकं स्यात्, is he making a universal statement or a statement restricted to particular class of phonemes? The statement certainly applies to all consonants since no two consonants can have totally identical efforts. But could we say the same thing about vowels? We think that even on the view यत्र सर्वं समानं तत्र सवर्णसंज्ञा, the pairs of short and long vowels (say **i** : **ī**) could still be *savarṇa* because the difference of length does not matter here. For the length is not included among the *prayatna*-s. So Pat.'s statement will not apply to vowels. But supposing that somehow — either on the ground that *sarvam* in this sentence is spacious enough to include length or, similarly, taking length as covered by आस्ये भवम् — Pat. regarded length also as a factor to be reckoned with in deciding the *sāvarṇya*, then his statement will apply to vowels also. But then we do not really know what was exactly in Pat.'s mind. So we keep the question open. We only know that Bhar. and Kaiy. have not explained Pat. correctly.

It is interesting to note that Bhaṭṭoji in his *Śabdakaustubha* does not follow Kaiy. He paraphrases सवर्णसंज्ञावचनम् by सवर्णसंज्ञाप्रणयनं which agrees with our interpretation given above. He further observes that if *sāvarṇya* had depended on complete identity of efforts, Pāṇini would not have taken the trouble of coining the term. He would have simply read his sūtra (1. 1. 69) as *अणुदित्तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नस्य (instead of अणुदित्सवर्णस्य), knowing full well that after all some cases were going to remain unexplained, *saṁjñā* or no *saṁjñā*. Read: न हि सर्वप्रयत्नसाम्यं विवक्षितुं शक्यम्। अङ्कित इत्याद्यसिद्धिप्रसङ्गात्। कङ्योरपि बाह्यप्रयत्नभेदात्। सर्वप्रयत्नसाम्यं हि स्वस्य स्वेनैवायाति, न तु परेण। तथा च सवर्णसंज्ञाप्रणयनमपि व्यर्थं स्यात्। 'अणुदित्तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नस्य' इत्युक्तौ सर्वसामञ्जस्यात्। 'झरो झरि' इत्युक्ते 'हलो यमां यमि' इत्यत्रेव यथासंख्यप्रवृत्त्या ... शिण्ढीत्यादौ डकारस्यापि लोपो न स्यादिति हि

1. And also translated the *Mbh.* accordingly.

सिद्धान्ते सवर्णग्रहणं कृतम्' स चाव्याप्तिदोषो यावत्प्रयत्नसाम्यविवक्षायां तदवस्थ एव स्यात् (*p.* 148, *ll.* 2–10)।

(*p.* 30, *l.* 21) शकारछकारयोः षकारठकारयोः ... etc. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : यदि तर्हि सति भेदे किंचित् समानमिति कृत्वा सवर्णसंज्ञा भविष्यति शकारच्छकारयोः षकारठकारयोः सकारथकारयोः सवर्णसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति। एतेषां हि सर्वमन्यत् समानं करणवर्जम्।

An objection against भेदे सति यत् समानं तदाश्रयिष्यामः. The sibilants *ś*, *ṣ* and *s* and the unvoiced aspirate mutes *ch*, *ṭh* and *th* have respectively a common place of articulation (*tālu*, *mūrdhan* and teeth respectively). Also aspiration (महाप्राणत्वम्) and absence of voice (अघोषत्वम्) are common. The difference is that *ch*, *ṭh* and *th* (referred to by एके in the *Dīp.*) have close contact or closure (*spṛṣṭatā*) as the *karaṇa* while the *karaṇa* of the other triad (*ś*, *ṣ*, *s*) is *vivṛta* (open). So the *sāvarṇya* becomes undesirably due between *ś* and *ch* etc.

The *Dīp.* सत्यां च सवर्णसंज्ञायाम् ... etc. is a reply to a possible question : What harm is there if, say, *ś* and *ch* become mutually *savarṇa* in grammar? The reply is that in words like निश्श्छद्म (=छद्मनो निष्क्रान्तम्। प्रादि-तत्पु.) where *ś* has been doubled by P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च, the second *ś* etc. will have to be dropped by P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे and a form with two *ś*-s will not be available.[1] Incidentally, all the three examples have been borrowed by Kaiy. with an addition of मधुलिट्स्थानम्.

[2.6]

एवं तर्हि त्रिपदोऽयं बहुव्रीहिः ... etc. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs thus : एवं तर्हि प्रयतनमेव प्रयत्नः, तदेव हि तद्धितान्तमास्यम्। न त्वयं द्वंद्वः — आस्यं च प्रयत्नश्च आस्यप्रयत्नमिति। किं तर्हि? त्रिपदोऽयं बहुव्रीहिः — तुल्य आस्ये प्रयत्न एषामिति।

Here while the other two elements are retained (प्रयत्नः=प्रयतनम्. तद्धितान्तमास्यम्), a new variation is introduced : आस्यप्रयत्न is not a Dvandva compound now, but the whole is a three-constituent Bahu°. तुल्य आस्ये प्रयत्न एषाम् means those phonemes whose effort in the *āsya* (i. e. the आभ्यन्तरप्रयत्न) is the same. Since

1. The argument is put forth on the view that P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे is obligatory. But it is doubtful, at least that is the view taken by the *Mbh.* I. 33. 10–34. 2, particularly the last sentence : तदेतदत्यन्तं संदिग्धं वर्तत आचार्याणां विभाषानुवर्तते न वेति. In the tradition, however, it is the accepted view, that the rules P. 8. 4. 64–65 are optional. On this view it does not matter if *ś* and *ch* became homogeneous. If you want a form with one *ś*, either (1) do not do anything. You have already straightway one-*ś* form, or (2) apply P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च (an optional rule which produces a second *ś*) and apply P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे. If, however, you want a form with two *ś*-s, then apply अनचि च and do *not* apply झरो झरि सवर्णे.

the आस्ये प्रयत्नः of *ś* and *ch* etc. is not the same, there is no danger now of their being named *savarṇa*.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 26) अभिधानाच्चासमानाधिकरणानाम् ... etc. The *Dīp*. removes a minor difficulty first. Normally only coreferential (समानाधिकरण) constituents can form a Bahu. compound (cf. the *Vār*. 10 : बहुव्रीहिः समानाधिकरणानाम् on P. 2. 3. 24). Still, by way of exception, such a compound can be accepted if it is current.

(*p*. 30, *l*. 26) ननु चैवमास्यं ... etc. This points out what is apparently a defect in the *tripada* Bahu. view. Here *tulya* qualifies *prayatna* (and so is in the Nominative). *Āsya* remains unqualified by *tulya* for two reasons : (1) *āsya* is in the Locative while *tulya*, as said above, is in the Nominative. (2) *Āsye* itself qualifies *prayatna* to which it is subordinate. So it cannot expect something to qualify it. When *āsya* is not qualified by *tulya*, then the condition of a common place of articulation remains unexpressed. The *tripada* Bahu. interpretation cannot he accepted. — The *Dīp*. नैष दोषः ... etc. answers this objection. When an *ādheya* A is connected with something, X, in some way, then it is understood that the *ādhāra* B (of the *ādheya* A) is connected with X in the same way. When it is said that Devadatta and Yajñadatta both equally got each his own meal in Madhurā, it goes without saying that both of them were equally in *Madhūrā*. The substratum for the eating (*bhojana*) must be a substratum for the eaters equally. Similarly, when a particular place is the substratum for the efforts (आस्ये ... प्रयत्नः) of certain phonemes, that place must be accepted as the place of articulation also for those phonemes. The आधेयतुल्यता implies आधारतुल्यता. So the *āsya* 'is' qualified by *tulya*. This definition (in the *tripada* Bahu. form) *does* lay down commonness of place of articulation as one of the necessary conditions. सामर्थ्यम्=अन्यथा वैयर्थ्यम्.

The objection and its reply is not found in Kaiy.

(*p*. 31, *l*. 4) अथ वा, पूर्वस्तत्पुरुषः — etc. In the previous (*tripada*) explanation *āsya* was not qualified by *tulya*. That weakness is here sought to be removed. First *tulyaḥ* directly qualifies *āsye*. Then *tulyāsya* forms a Bahu° with *prayatna*.

The *Dīp*. raises an objection against the formation of the Tatpuruṣa *tulyāsya* from *tulya āsye*. There is no rule (*lakṣaṇa*) that sanctions such a Tatpuruṣa with a nominal in Locative as a second constituent. Perhaps it will be suggested (*yadi*) that the use of the finished form (*nipātana*) is itself a sufficient authority, dispensing with a specific rule to that effect. But that is not reasonable. The *nipātana* will at the most justify *a* compound, but not specifically a Tatpuruṣa compound. Bhar. therefore suggests that the rule सप्तमी शौण्डैः (P. 2. 1. 40) be split into two. The first part (सप्तमी), with the predicate समर्थः समास:

(=सप्तमी येन केनापि समर्थेन सुबन्तेन सह समस्यते, तत्पुरुषश्च समासो भवति) will sanction this compound.

But then a difficulty arises. By P. 1. 2. 43 : प्रथमानिर्दिष्टं समास उपसर्जनम् the word in locative (which forms a compound with a following constituent) gets the name *upasarjana* and consequently it has to take the first position in the compound (**āsyatulya*) by P. 2. 2. 30 : उपसर्जनं पूर्वम्. How is then the order *tulyāsya* which conflicts with the rule to be justified? Here, however, Bhar. has to resort to the *nipātana*.

(*p*. 31, *l*. 6) अथ वार्थप्रदर्शनम् ... etc. An alternative explanation of तुल्य आस्ये. If the Locative is used in showing the dissolution of the compound, it is just to make the idea clear (अर्थप्रदर्शनम्). Actually *āsya* is to be understood as Nominative, *āsyaḥ*, meaning 'belonging to the place of articulation' and it qualifies *prayatna* (तुल्यश्चासौ आस्यश्च तुल्यास्यः). The compound is formed by P. 2. 1. 68 : कृत्यतुल्याख्या अजात्या according to which *tulya* can form a compound with a correferential word (provided the latter does not mean some genus).

Readings : (1) (*p*. 28, *l*. 25) MS °दृशानाम्. — (2) (*p*. 28, *l*. 26) MS AL Sw transp. स्पर्शानाम् and इति.—(3) (*p*. 29, *l*. 3) MS संभवति (for न भ°).— (4) (*p*. 29, *l*. 7) *Mbh*. ed. विवारसंवारौ. — (5) (*p*. 29, *l*. 18) *Mbh*. ed. भविष्यति. — (6) (*p*. 29, *l*. 18) MS Sw यत्नोपन-; AL यत्न प्रयतन- (for यत्नोत्पादन-). — (7) (*p*. 29, *l*. 21) MS विशेषणरूपेण.—(8) (*p*. 29, *l*. 23) MSALSw यत्प्रत्ययान्तम्. — (9) (*p*. 29, *l*. 28) MS स्थानाभिन्नानां (which is palpably wrong). — (10) (*p*. 30, *l*. 4) Sw दर्शने. — (11) (*p*. 30, *l*. 6) MS क्षीरधिर्दुः; Sw क्षीरदधि दुः. — (12) (*p*. 30, *l*. 9) MS नैयतीति; AL रैय° (for नौय°). — (13) (*p*. 30, *ll*. 17-18) AL साम्यं (in both places) (for सास्ये). — (14) (*p*. 30, *l*. 21) *Mbh*. ed. सत्येव हि भेदे. — (15) (*p*. 30, *l*. 25) *Mbh*. ed. किं तर्हि (for एवं तर्हि). — (16) (*p*. 30, *l*. 27) Sw वि(भिन्न)विभक्तित्वात्. This is unnecessary since विविभक्तित्व in the sense of विभिन्नभक्तित्व is attested in the *Mbh*. (I. 88. 8 ; III. 178. 15, 303. 20). — (17) (*p*. 30, *l*. 26) Sw तदाधेयं तुल्यं (चेत्) तथैव (तदधिकरणमपि) तुल्य°. — (18) (*p*. 31, *l*. 2) MS आस्यमिति. — (19) (*p*. 31, *l*. 5) MS AL Sw न तुल्यत(AL °स्त)त्पुरुषः.

[3]

तस्य is the initial part of the *Vār*. 3 : तस्यावचनं वचनप्रामाण्यात्. It is explained in the *Mbh*. thus : 'तस्य'। तस्येति तु वक्तव्यम्। किं प्रयोजनम्? यो यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नः स तस्य सवर्णसंज्ञो यथा स्यात्। अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नोऽन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञो मा भूत्। If A has a common *āsya* and a common *prayatna* with B, A should be *savarṇa* with B and vice versa. A should not be *savarṇa* with D simply because A has a common *āsya* and a common *prayatna* with some phoneme, viz. B. To ensure this, *tasya* has to be read in the Sū. according to the *pūrvapakṣa*.

(*p*. 31, *l*. 10) अर्थप्रदर्शनमेतत् ... etc. Bhar. points out that *tasya* is not meant to be the exact word to be added to the Sū. It is just meant to convey the idea which has to be additionally expressed in the Sū. He illustrates this by two formations, (1) तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं यद्यस्य ... and (2) तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं तत्तस्य .... In the second formation the words यस्य यद् will be automatically understood. So they could be dispenced with (as in 2). Cf. Kaiy. : यत्तदोर्नित्याभिसंबन्धात् ...

The *Dīp.* इतरथा हि... (*l*. 13) etc. explains the undesired situation that will result if the addition, such as that of *tasya*, is not effected. In the position $ak+X$ (a vowel), for example, if X is a *savarṇa* of *any* phoneme, then the rule अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (P. 6. 1. 101) will have to be applied, which will result into an undesired lengthening of *ak*, even if *ak* and X are not mutually homogeneous. Let us take a concrete example, say तत्र + इति. Here *i* which follows *a* is *savarṇa* with *ī* because of common *āsya* and *prayatna*. When such an *i*, which has acquired the name *savarṇa*, follows *a* (in *tatra*), P. 6. 1. 101 becomes due because *i* need not be *savarṇa* with *a*. All that it needs is that it be *savarṇa* with *some* phoneme. In order to stress mutual 'homogeneousness', and thus avoid the undesired result, *tasya* is necessary, says the *pūrvapakṣin*.

The *Dīp.* सूत्रारम्भः किमर्थः (*l*. 16) ... etc. raises an objection against this suggestion (of adding *tasya*) and also replies it. If *sāvarṇya* with any phoneme could bring out an operation in connection with any other phoneme not homogenous with it (to prevent which addition of *tasya* is suggested), then why should Pāṇini coin the form *savarṇa* with some conditions at all? For, no useful purpose will be left to it. There will be confusion. Pāṇini would not have coined that term at all. — No, says the advocate of the suggestion. Even then the term can be of some use. The *Mbh.*[1] (I. 28. 12) : रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति says that *r* and the *ūṣman*-s have no *savarṇa*. This would mean that these two classes of phonemes do not have any phonemes which would share their *prayatna*. So in no case they will undergo or cause an operation depending on *sāvarṇya*. This will be the utility of coining the term *savarṇa* even when the restriction यद् यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं तत् तस्य सवर्णम् is not there. Since सामर्थ्य does not work *tasya* has to be specifically added.

[3. 1]

तस्यावचनमिति. Bhar. has here quoted only a part of the *Vār*. 3 for explaining a grammatical point, the rest being quoted after it. The full text of the *Vār*. is as follow : तस्यावचनं वचनप्रामाण्यात्. तस्यावचनम् is explained in the *Mbh.* as तस्येति न वक्तव्यम्.

---

1. Under the Śiva-Sū. हयवरट् ॥ ५ ॥

(*p*. 31, *l*. 19) असमासोऽयम्. Pat., going by his explanation तस्येति न वक्तव्यम्, evidently regards तस्य as a quotation of the word तस्य mentioned previously. The *iti* is a sufficient proof for that (cf. P. 1. 4. 62). So, for Pat. तस्यावचनम् is evidently a compound of 'तस्य'+अवचनम्, meaning 'तस्य'(शब्द)स्य अवचनम्. Bhar., however, for some reason which is not easy to see, does not prefer this interpretation. He definitely states that this is not a compound. Obviously, the expression, according to him, is just a phrase of two independent words, where तद् (in तस्य) is a demonstrative pronoun referring to the previously mentioned word (यः शब्दो भवतोच्चारितः) viz. तस्य. — However, after this, he gives the other interpretation also. Nevertheless, his dissatisfaction with the interpretation given by Pat. is not concealed. Here Kaiy. does not follow him. Read: 'तस्य' इत्ययमनुकरणशब्दः । 'तस्य' इत्यस्यावचनमित्यर्थः । Nāg. clearly says: तस्यावचनमित्यत्र षष्ठीतत्पुरुष इति भावः. But curiously he himself does not favour the *samāsa* view. He himself agrees with the explanation given by Bhar. though he does not name him, as he continues: वस्तुतस्तच्छब्देन पूर्वोक्तस्य तस्यशब्दस्य परामर्श इति वक्तुं युक्तम् ।

(*p*. 31, *l*. 20) वचनप्रामाण्यात्. The *Mbh.* comments on this thus: तस्येति न वक्तव्यम् । अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नोऽन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञः कस्मान्न भवति? वचनप्रामाण्यात् । सवर्णसंज्ञावचनसामर्थ्यात् । यदि ह्यन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नोऽन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञः स्यात्, सवर्णसंज्ञावचनमनर्थकं स्यात् । The सामर्थ्य (or प्रामाण्य) means अन्यथावैयर्थ्य. If there had been a confusion or undesired result (viz. अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वे अन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञत्वम्), Pāṇini would not have coined the term *savarṇa* at all, for it would be meaningless. The very fact that he coins it, shows that the undesired result: अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वे अन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञत्वम् does not follow. The addition of *tasya* is not necessary.

(*p*. 31, *l*. 21) ननु चोक्तं रेफोष्मणां ... etc. It will be remembered that this argument based on प्रामाण्य (or सामर्थ्य) was already anticipated by the supporter of the addition of *tasya* and a utility for the *saṁjñā* was pointed out by him (in the *Dīp.*) even if one were to accept अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वे अन्यस्य सवर्णसंज्ञत्व possibility. It was shown that the absence of a homogeneous phoneme for *r* and for *ūṣman*-s will still be a utility for coining the term *savarṇa*. The opponent of the addition of *tasya* now contradicts that argument, showing that that utility is more apparent than real (तच्चासत्).

The sentence तेऽपि हि परस्परेण तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नाः, रेफो रेफान्तरेण ... etc. refutes the statement of the *pūrvapakṣin* : ... रेफोष्मणां निवृत्त्यर्थः । 'रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति, इति नास्त्येषां तुल्यस्थानप्रयत्नता । Since the utility is denied, the argument based on सामर्थ्य or प्रामाण्य stands. The addition of *tasya* is not necessary.

Nāg. points out that the *Mbh.* statement: रेफोष्मणां सवर्णा न सन्ति is not violated by Kaiy.'s statement रेफस्यापि रेफः सवर्णो भवति etc. (corresponding to

the *Dīp.* तेऽपि हि परस्परेण तुल्यास्यप्रयत्ना:, रेफो रेफान्तरेण ... etc.). All that the *Mbh.* means, says Nāg., is that they do not have a *vijātīya savarṇa*. रेफोष्मणामित्येतद् विजातीयसवर्णाभावप्रतिपादनपरमित्यर्थ: । (There is no other phoneme which is both तुल्यास्य and तुल्यप्रयत्न with *r*. The cerebral occlusives have a common *āsya* (viz. *mūrdhan*) with it but no *prayatna* : their effort is *spṛṣṭa* while that of *r* is *īṣatspṛṣṭa*. Also the *sāvarṇya* of *ūṣman*-s with vowels is barred by P. 1. 1. 10: नाज्झलौ.) But since the *sajātīya* phonemes (तुल्यास्यप्रयत्न, and therefore सवर्ण) are possible even in the case of *r* and *ūṣman*-s, no utility will be left for coining the term *savarṇa* if अन्यस्य तुल्यास्यप्रयत्न: becomes अन्यस्य सवर्ण:. So on the force of सामर्थ्य or वचन the word *tasya* will be automatically understood. (एवं च व्यावर्त्याभावेन सवर्णसंज्ञावचनसामर्थ्याद् 'यस्य तस्य' इति लप्स्यत इति भाव: as Nāg. says.) So the express addition of *tasya* is not necessary.

[3.2]

(*p*. 31, *l*. 24) संबन्धिशब्दैर्वा तुल्यम् (वा. ४). The *Mbh.* explains the *Vār.* thus : संबन्धिशब्दैर्वा पुनस्तुल्यमेतत् । तद्यथा संबन्धिशब्दा: 'मातरि वर्तितव्यम्', 'पितरि शुश्रूषितव्यम्' इति । न चोच्यते 'स्वस्यां मातरि', 'स्वस्मिन् पितरि' इति । संबन्धाच्चैतद् गम्यते — या यस्य माता, यश्च पितेति । एवमिहापि 'तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्' इत्यत्र संबन्धिशब्दावेतौ । तत्र संबन्धादेतद् गन्तव्यम् — यत् प्रति यत् तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं तत् सवर्णं भवतीति । The argument is that the two words तुल्यास्य and तुल्यप्रयत्न are relative (संबन्धिशब्दावेतौ). So it is the mutual similarity of *āsya* and *prayatna* that is intended: not the similarity of any phoneme with any other in these respects. (Kaiy. introduces the argument thus : एवं वचनसामर्थ्याद् दोषं परिहृत्य शाब्दन्यायेन परिहर्तुमाह — संबन्धिशब्दैरिति.)

Bhar. points out explicitly the purpose of using words like *mātṛ*, *pitṛ* in *mātari vartitavyam* etc. The statement is not meant to convey that the woman is not barren or that the man is not impotent. The purpose is to refer to the person concerned who, as the son, should behave in such and such a way towards *his* parents. It is not meant to teach him how he should behave with a man and a woman who happen to be the parents of some other person. — अस्य = पितृशब्दस्य मातृशब्दस्य च. प्रजनन = offspring (here). Usually it means generating (mfn.) or generator (m.) or generating (n.).

In तुल्याय कन्या दातव्या (quoted by Kaiy. also) Bhar. gives a *laukika* parallel.

Observation : Pat. says संबन्धिशब्दावेतौ. Which two words he means? Bhar. does not say anything. As said above we take तुल्यास्यप्रयत्न and सवर्ण as the two intended relative terms. About तुल्यास्यप्रयत्न there is no doubt because of the word *tulya*. Kaiy. has some doubt about *savarṇa* as a relative term. So he explains : तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नस्य संबन्धिशब्दत्वात् तत्समानार्थोऽपि प्रदेशवाक्येषूपात्त: सवर्णशब्द:

संबन्धिशब्दः. Nāg. who believes that तुल्यास्य and तुल्यप्रयत्न are the two words intended by Pat. criticises Kaiy. We follow Kaiy. in taking तुल्यास्यप्रयत्न in this Sū. and सवर्ण in rules like अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः (=अकः स्वसवर्णे अचि परतो दीर्घः) as two relative terms. In other words, the emphasis *sva* (one's own) is not there when the term *savarṇa* is defined. It is there when an operation is taught, with *sāvarṇya* as a condition.

Readings: (1) (*p*. 31, *l*. 11) MS तत्रपि; AL तत्रापि (for तत्र वि-).— (2) (*p*. 31, *l*. 11) Sw drops यत् after वक्तव्यम्. — (3) (*p*. 31, *l*. 13) MS यस्येदिति (for यस्य यदिति). — (4) (*p*. 31, *l*. 15) MS -प्रयत्नस्य ; Sw °त्नस्स (for °त्नस्तस्य). — (5) (*p*. 31, *l*. 17) MS रेफो ऊष्मसु व ; Sw रेफोष्मसु च. — (6) (*p*. 32, *l*. 1) AL अकि (for अचि).

[4]

This is the last topic discussed under this Sū., viz. the necessity or otherwise of teaching the *sāvarṇya* of *ṛ* and *ḷ*. It is not available, because their places of articulation are not the same. But it seems desirable. Hence the *Vār*. (5) : ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः.

The *Mbh*. on this *Vār*. reads thus : ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णसंज्ञा विधेया। होतृ ऌकारः=होतॄकारः। किं प्रयोजनम् ? 'अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इति दीर्घत्वं यथा स्यात्। The euphony of होतृ+ऌकारः is desired to be होतॄकारः. Now, *ṝ* can come in as a single long substitute (by P. 6. 1. 101) only if *ṛ* and *ḷ* are *savarṇa*. Hence the *Vār*.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 3) सवर्णाश्रयस्य कार्यस्य विधिः. This is how Bhar. first interprets सवर्णविधिः of the *Vār*. But immediately afterwards he reverts to the interpretation given by Pat. (संज्ञा विधेया) as being more economic. — अथात्र कथं ... etc. raises a question as to how mutuality of homogeneousness is to be understood as intended, in the absence of a relative term. Bhar. makes two suggestions. Either a word *mithaḥ* 'mutually' be added, or the *Vār*. as it is should not be understood as the formal text, but just an indication.

The *Dīp*. adds that होतॄकारः is a compound (taught by P. 2. 2. 8 : षष्ठी) in the sense होतुर्लृकारः (phoneme *ḷ* of — i. e. uttered by — the *Hotṛ*).

(*p*. 32, *l*. 10) नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् ... etc. This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh*. : नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। वक्ष्यत्येतद् 'सवर्णदीर्घत्वे ऋति ऋवावचनम्', 'ऌति ऌवावचनम्' इति।

This *Mbh*. requires some explanation so that its thrust is understood. Here the subject of वक्ष्यति is 'Vārttikakāraḥ'. The two statements quoted are two Vārttikas on P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः. They teach that when *ṛ* and *ḷ* follow *ak* vowels then optionally both the originals in each case are replaced by

(*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ respectively (i. e. we have a single (*r*)ṛ for *ak*+ṛ and a single
(*l*)ḷ for *ak*+ḷ). So, for होतृ+ऋकारः we have होतॄकारः (rather होत(ॢ)ऋकारः).
Two points are to be noted about these substitutes : (1) These are not the same
ordinary ṛ and ḷ. They are not *vivṛta*, but said to be *īṣatspṛṣṭa*. As regards
their length, some say that they have swo moras, while others ascribe different
lengths to them. Further, it is said that this special ṛ contains two consonantal
r- sounds (and similarly ḷ contains two consonantal *l*- sounds) with an *aj-bhakti*
around them. Read the *SidKau.* : उभयत्रापि विधेयं वर्णद्वयं द्विमात्रम् । आद्यस्य मध्ये
द्वौ रेफौ तयोरेका मात्रा । अभितोऽज्भक्तेरपरा । द्वितीयस्य तु मध्ये द्वौ लकारौ । शेषं प्राग्वत् ।
We have reproduced these two special ṛ and ḷ sounds in the translation by (*r*)ṛ
and *l*(ḷ) respectively. (2) These two substitutes are optional (*vā*). That
means that there is some other alternative possibility also.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 11) एवं मन्यते ... etc. This *Dīp.* explains the *Mbh.* नैतदस्ति
प्रयोजनम् ... etc. which opposes the suggestion (made in the *Vār.*) to extend the
name *savarṇa* to ṛ and ḷ. The name *savarṇa* is not necessary for the Saṁdhi
होतॄकारः (from होतृ+ऌकार). The argument made in the *Mbh.*, which is not at
all clear at the outset, is thus made clear in the *Dīp.* : The name *savarṇa* is,
after all, intended to account for the Saṁdhi ṛ+ḷ=ṝ. This can be secured even
without the name *savarṇa* for ṛ and ḷ. The two *Vār.*-s (on P. 6. 1. 101) are to
be completed by *dīrghaḥ* ' long ' from the Sū. So the other optional substitute
has to be long. Now in the case of ṛ+ḷ, there will be *l*(ḷ) as taught by the *Vār.*
But this substitute will be only optional (*vāvacanam*). What will be the
other alternative (पक्षे) for the long substitute ? It is claimed that, although a
normal long is not available by P. 6. 1. 101 (because of the absence of *sāvarṇya*
between ṛ and ḷ), still on the strength of the *Vār.* injunction *some* long will have
to come in. Which one will it be ? Since there is no *ḹ, it is out of question.
Ā, *ī* and *ū* are also ruled out, since they have no affinity either with ṛ or
with ḷ. So the only remaining one, viz. ṝ, which has at least affinity with one
original, will come in. Since the desired single long substitute ṝ is thus available,
where is the need of the name *savarṇa* for ṛ and ḷ ? Cf. Kaiy. : तत्र ' ऌवावचनम् '
इत्यत्र दीर्घ इत्यनुवर्तते । तत्र ऌति ऌशब्दे विकल्पितेऽप्राप्त एव पक्षे दीर्घो भविष्यति । स च
भवन् ऌवर्णस्य दीर्घाभावात् ऋवर्णस्यान्तरतम्याद् दीर्घ ॠकारो भविष्यति. The *Śabda-*
kaustubha of Bhaṭṭoji is also worth quoting here : द्विमात्रोऽयम् (i. e. (ॡ)ॠ वा) ।
मध्ये द्वौ रेफौ तयोरेका मात्रा अभितोऽज्भक्तेरपरा । ईषत्स्पृष्टश्चायम् । तत्र प्रयत्नभेदाद् ऋका-
रेणाग्रहणाद् अनच्त्वाद् दीर्घसंज्ञाया अभावाद् अप्राप्तोऽयं विधीयते । ऌति ऌ वेति । अयमपि
द्विमात्र ईषत्स्पृष्टश्च ... तेनाप्राप्त एव दीर्घो भविष्यति । तत् किं सवर्णसंज्ञया ?

Observation : Bhar. here seems to have kept everything vague delibera-
tely — the constitution of the two substitutes *r*(ṛ) and *l*(ḷ) taught in the two
Vār.-s, their length and manner of articulation, also whether the word *savarṇe* is

understood in the *Vār*.-s — to let all these features unfold themselves naturally and gradually in the course of discussion.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 14) तद् सवर्णे यथा स्यात् etc. This *Mbh*. refutes the above argument and pleads for the name *savarṇa* for *ṛ* and *ḷ*. It points out that the two *Vār*.-s cannot be a substitute for the teaching of the *savarṇa-saṁjñā*. Indeed, those *Vār*.-s themselves imply a word *savarṇe* in them (to qualify *ṛti* and *ḷti*). For, in the absence of such a qualification, the rule will apply to any *ak* (preceding *ṛ*/*ḷ*) and then the substitute *l*(*ḷ*) will result undesiredly in cases like *dadhi*+*ḷkāraḥ*.

तत् = वार्त्तिकद्वयम्.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 16) यदेतद् ऋतीति ... etc. The following is the text of the *Mbh*. here : यदेतत् सवर्णदीर्घत्व ऋतीति, एतद् ऋत इति वक्ष्यामि। तत ऌति। ऌकारे च वा ऌ भवति। ऋत इत्येव। The opponent here argues that by making a small change in the wording of the first *Vār*., viz. by reading *ṛtaḥ* in the place of *ṛti*, he can manage the whole thing without needing *sāvarṇya* between *ṛ* and *ḷ*. The opponent also brings down *savarṇe* (from P. 6. 1. 101) into the first *Vār*. (now ऋतः सवर्णे ऋ वा) but not into the second (now = ऋतः ऌति ऌ वा).

Since the *savarṇa* of *ṛ* is *ṛ* itself, the first *Vār*. will apply only to the position *ṛ* + *ṛ*. (So we shall have, from *hotṛ* + *ṛkāraḥ hot*(*r*)*ṛkāraḥ* and, of course, optionally *hotṝkāraḥ* (P. 6. 1. 101.) There will be no harm in cases like *dhātṛ* + *aṁśaḥ* because *a* is not *savarṇa* with *ṛ*.

With the second *Vār*., from *hotṛ*+*ḷkāra* we shall get *hot*(*l*)*ḷkāraḥ* (and also *hotṝkāraḥ* as shown above). Since the preceding (first) original has to be *ṛ*, there is no danger now of an over-extension of this rule to cases like *dadhi* + *ḷkāraḥ*, a defect which the *savarṇa-saṁjñāvādin* pointed out above. So the *Vār*. ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णविधिः is unnecessary, says the opponent.

तेन ऋकारे त्रीणि रूपाणि (*l*. 17) ... etc. points out that apart from the two forms mentioned above (which imply euphony), there is a third optional form also, viz. *hotṛ-ṛkāraḥ* (and *hotṛ-ḷkāraḥ*) if no euphony is executed (because of the option given by P. 6. 1. 128 : ऋत्यकः).

(*p*. 32, *l*. 19) तन्न वक्तव्यं भवति. तद् again refers to the two Vārttikas. The advocate of ऋकारऌकारयोः सवर्णसंज्ञा points out that there is economy in laying down the *savarṇa saṁjñā*; it saves the framing of the additional two rules (तन्न वक्तव्यं भवति). The *Dīp*. एवं मन्यते brings out the idea thus : Both *r*(*ṛ*) and *l*(*ḷ*) are long (*dīrgha*). So we can have these substitutes by P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः itself, provided *ṛ* and *ḷ* are accepted as *savarṇa*. Besides we will optionally have *ṝ* as the substitute in both the cases.

(*p*. 32, *l*. 22) अवश्यं तद् वक्तव्यम् ... etc. A reply by the opponent, the advocate of the two *Vār*.-s. He denies the long status for *r*(*ṛ*) and *l*(*ḷ*) for two reasons : (1) According to some the duration of these sounds is not two moras which is necessary for the designation *dīrgha* (long). (2) According to others, their duration may be two moras, but their manner of articulation is not *vivṛta* (open), but either *īṣatspṛṣṭa* (slightly touched) or *saṁvṛtatara* (more closed). So they cannot be comprehended (by P. 1. 1. 69) by *ṛ* and *ḷ* which are read in the alphabet and consequently they do not get the name '*ac*' — and the basic qualification of being an *ac* is necessary for being called *dīrgha* by P. 1. 2. 27 : ऊकालोऽच् ....

The *Dīp*. कथमनच्त्वम्? केचिन्मन्यन्ते (*l*. 23) ... etc. gives three different views regarding the structure, duration, and the manner of articulation of *r*(*ṛ*) and *l*(*ḷ*). (Some letters seem to be corrupt in the MS. The reconstruction here is tentative. See Readings below.)

(1) According to this view, (*r*)*ṛ* consists of two 'half' (अर्धौ) *r* sounds (by implication, *l*(*ḷ*) similarly consists of two half *l* sounds) and a mora of a vocalic element (अङ्मात्रा=अज्भक्तिमात्रा). It seems that by a 'half' *r* a, *r* of half a mora is intended. The total duration, then, will be 1 mora (of 2 *r*-s)+1 mora (of the *aj-bhakti* on two sides)=2 moras. Since the duration of 2 moras could entitle these (*r*)*ṛ* and *l*(*ḷ*) sounds to the designation *dīrgha*, the point about their manner of articulation, viz. ईषत्स्पृष्ट (slightly touched=slightly open) as against the *vivṛta* of normal *ac* sounds is brought in immediately.

(2) Two 'quarter' *r*/*l* sounds+a mora of vocalic element. By the same token, the two *r* (and *l*) sounds would now make half a mora ($\frac{1}{4} \times 2$). So together the duration of these sounds would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ moras each. The *Dīp*. does not say anything further on this. It may be that since the duration does not come to 2 moras, no further comment was thought necessary.

(3) A 'full' $r + r + \frac{1}{2}$ mora of *ajbhakti*, so $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 2$ moras. (Here the total duration of the *ajbhakti* is not 1 mora as in the earlier two explanations but reduced to $\frac{1}{2}$.) Since the total duration of these sounds is 2 moras, which qualifies them for *dīrgha*, their basic *ac* status itself is challenged in the *Dīp*. संवृततरोऽयम् ... etc. After प्रयत्नभेदात्, scil. सावर्ण्याभावात्.

Kaiy. does not give these three views elaborately. He simply says : न चेति। अर्धतृतीयमात्रत्वादिति केचिदाहुः। अन्ये तु ईषत्स्पृष्टकरणत्वादनयोः, ऋकारऌकारयोश्च विवृतत्वात्, ताभ्यां तयोरग्रहणादनच्त्वमाहुः।

Incidentally, Bhar. does not refer to the $2\frac{1}{2}$ mora view (अर्धतृतीयमात्रः) here, though he refers to it expressly later on.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 1) अच्त्वं वक्ष्यामि etc. The full *Mbh.* sentence is : (ॠ)ऋकारस्य (ऌ)ऌकारस्य चाच्त्वं वक्ष्यामि. The protagonist of the *savarṇasaṁjñā* finds a way out. He says that he will declare the *ac* status of (*r*)ṛ and *l*(ḷ). Then the name *dīrgha* will be available for them (सत्यच्त्वे दीर्घसंज्ञा लभ्यते). According to Nāg. *vakṣyāmi* does not mean 'I shall declare' the *ac* status. It is not to be made just *vācanika*. The (*r*)ṛ/(*l*)ḷ have to be read in the alphabet, say among the *ayogavāha*-s.

In यस्य तु पक्षः etc. the *Dīp.* points out that this *ac* status, even if thus gained, will not be of any use to one who believes that these (*r*)ṛ/(*l*)ḷ consist of 2½ moras each. For, the specific condition that duration of 2 moras (*ūkāla*) is required for the designation *dīrgha* remains unfulfilled. (Similarly Kaiy.)

In the *Dīp.* scil. अपि after अच्त्वे सति for the sake of clarity.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 3) तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh*. तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्। प्लुतो यथा स्यात्। होतृऋकारः होतॄकारः होतृ३कारः। होतृऌकारः होतॢकारः होतॢ३कार इति।

The सवर्णसंज्ञावादिन् says that this laying down of the name *savarṇa* for ṛ and ḷ is not necessary for him alone. Even for the opponent, who is the advocate of the two *Vār*.-s, this is necessary. A Pluta for *ac* phonemes (P. 1. 2. 27) is taught in certain contexts, such as calling from a distance etc. (P. 8. 2. 82, 84 etc.). In the absence of *ac* status, these (*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ will not be able to become Pluta. What is the use of the mere teaching of these phonemes? (विधानमात्रमनयोः स्यात्, नाच्कार्यं प्लुतः as Kaiy. says). Since the declaring of *ac* status for (*r*)ṛ/(*l*)ḷ is as much necessary for the opponent (त्वयापि ... ऋवावचनं ब्रुवता), he cannot oppose it.

यश्चासौ क्रियते=द्विमात्रिकः ईषत्स्पृष्टः (ॠ)ऋकारः (ऌ)ऌकारः वा. असावपि=अस्यापि स्थाने. It is to be remembered that for a Pluta substitute, not only the substitute has to be *ac*, but even the *sthānin* has to have that designation. Cf. the *SidKau*. on अचश्च (P. 1. 2. 28): ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतशब्दैर्यत्राज् विधीयते तत्राच इति षष्ठ्यन्तं पदमुपतिष्ठते. The *Kāś*. is more explicit. It remarks: परिभाषेयं स्थानिनियमार्था। ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुताः स्वसंज्ञया शिष्यमाणा अच एव स्थाने वेदितव्याः।

Incidentally, the remark यश्च सवर्णसंज्ञामारभते etc. does not find its echo in Kaiy.

(*p*. 33, *l*. 8) किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः. In the environment ṛ+ṛ, three forms are desired: (1) (*r*)ṛ, (2) ṝ, and (3) ṛṛ (Prakṛtibhāva). Similarly, in ṛ+ḷ, three forms desired are (1) (*l*)ḷ (2) ṝ, and (3) ṛḷ (Prakṛtibhāva). All the three in each position can be had either by teaching *sāvarṇya* between ṛ and ḷ or by framing the two additional rules (*Vār*.-s). Which course is better, सवर्णसंज्ञाविधानम् or ऋति ऋवावचनम् and ऌति ऌवावचनम्? That is the question.

The *Dīp.* अत्र चोद्यते etc. raises an objection against the *Mbh.* query. The two methods do not give exactly the same results. What is then the point in asking which course is better ? This objection is explained at length in the following *Dīp.*

In यदि सवर्णसंज्ञा विधीयते (*l.* 10) ... etc. the objector examines the alternative of teaching *sāvarṇya* which claims that the two *Vār.*-s need not be read.

(1) In the position होतृ+ऋकार both the *sthānin*-s (i. e. the two *ṛ*-s) contain a consonantal *r* (*repha*) each. When P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः is applied, both (1) the normal (*vivṛta*) *ṝ* and (2) the special (*r*)*ṛ* (granting it is 'long') present themselves. If *sthānin*-s containing two *r*-s require, on the ground of *āntaratamya*, a substitute with two *r*-s alone, then *r*(*ṛ*) alone will materialize, as that alone satisfies the requirement. The other, *ṝ*, will not take place at all (होतृऋकार इति ... द्विरेफको दीर्घः प्राप्नोति).

(1a) If it is held that (*r*)*ṛ* has a more closed (संवृततर) articulation, then it cannot come in as a substitute in the place of *ṛ*+*ṛ* both of which are *vivṛta*. So *ṝ* alone will be available because of the affinity of manner of articulation. So either *ṝ* or (*r*)*ṛ*, not both.

(2) In the position *ṛ*+*ḷ* (होतृऌकार), the *sthānin*-s contain *r*+*l*. There is no long vocalic substitute which contains *r* and *l*. So, as the next best, alternately (पर्यायेण) there will be *ṝ* and (*l*)*ḷ*.

Observation : So far, in this position (*ṛ*+*ḷ*) it seems all right. No defect has come to light. One therefore wonders what the *Dīp.* means when the MS (*l.* 16) reads इति दोषः (कदाचित् दीर्घः स्यात्, कदाचित् ऌ(ॡ) इति दोषः). When the two optional forms are thus available (plus the Prakṛtibhāva form), the reading दोषः passes one's understanding. We therefore follow AL and read the MS as दीर्घः. This suits the line of thought best and is also not orthographically impossible.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 17) अथ मन्यसे ... etc. Now the defect will be brought out by the objector. If the *savarṇa-saṁjñāvādin* thinks that all the forms are thus available, he is wrong. They are available only in a particular environment (viz. भिन्नविषयौ ऋकारऌकारौ), but not in a different one (अन्यत् तस्मात्)[1]. They are available in the environment ऋ+ऌ (*bhinnaviṣayau*) but not in the environment ऌ+ऌ[2] (अथ मन्यसे ... अन्यत् तस्मात्).

1. Rather an unusual phrase, suggesting समानविषयौ.

2. भिन्नविषयौ, though such a simple word, is rather vague as to what it exactly means. We have interpreted it as above following a suggestion from Pt. V. B. Bhagavat based on the use of the word विषय in the *Uddyota* in this very context.

To explain : When $\underset{\circ}{l}$ follows $\underset{\circ}{l}$ (e. g. in गम्ऌ-ऌकार 'phoneme $\underset{\circ}{l}$ in the root *gam-ḷ*'), there is no *ṛ* in the two *sthānin*-s. So there is no *r*. Naturally, only that long substitute is eligible which contains *l*; it need not contain *r*. So only (*l*)*ḷ* results as the substitute. *Ṛ* cannot come in. *Rūpatrayam* cannot be achieved on the *savarṇa-saṁjñā-vidhāna* alternative.

The *Dīp.* यस्तु (ऌ)ऌ विधत्ते तस्य कथम् (*l.* 18) contains a counter-objection posed by the *savarṇasaṁjñāvādin*. How does the advocate of the the two rules ऋति ऋवावचनम् etc. himself provide for such a position? Is not the defect common to both sides? — No, says the opponent : असौ... पक्षे दीर्घत्वं विदधात्येव. While laying down (*l*)*ḷ* as the substitute in the position *ḷ*+*ḷ*, he also lays down a long substitute optionally (*vā*), which is, of course, *ṝ*. (How? It is not clear.)

(*p.* 33, *l.* 20) ननु च तस्यापि सवर्णसंज्ञा ... etc. This *Dīp.* shows that the triad of forms is available, even on the *savarṇasaṁjñā* view, in the *samānaviṣaya* context i. e. *ḷ*+*ḷ* (and also *ṛ*+*ṛ*). The word *saṁnihita* 'at hand, available' means available as the *sthānin*[1] on account of *sāvarṇya*. The result is that the context *ṛ*+*ṛ* can be looked upon as being *ṛ*+*ḷ* (or *ḷ*+*ṛ*). P. 6. 1. 101 operates, resulting in not only *ṝ* and *r*(*ṛ*), but also a third form (*l*)*ḷ*, since being *dīrgha*, and containing a *l*, it has as much a right to come in as a substitute as *r*(*ṛ*). (And in this process we thus get an additional form — a *fourth* one! — which is not available on the other alternative.) Similarly, the context *ḷ*+*ḷ* can be looked upon as *ṛ*+*ḷ* (or *ḷ*+*ṛ*) and, with P. 6. 1. 101, we again get the same three forms : *ṝ*, (*r*)*ṛ* and (*l*)*ḷ*. So the opponent's claim : भिन्नविषयौ ऋकारऌकारौ परिगृह्य त्रैशब्द्यं सिध्येत्, न त्वन्यत्तस्मात् cannot be accepted. You get not only *traiśabdyam*, but *cātuḥśabdyam*.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 21) स्यादेतत् । प्रविभाग ··· प्राप्नोति एव. An objection against the above argument and a reply to it. The objection could be taken thus : You cannot have those three forms by taking (*r*)*ṛ* and (*l*)*ḷ* side by side. You could have either the one or the other. The fact that Kāt. frames two separate rules, teaching only one substitute in any one environment, should indicate that he did not want the two to come together in any one environment. He probably wanted (*r*)*ṛ* when *ṛ* followed (i. e. *ṛ*+*ṛ*) and (*l*)*ḷ* when *ḷ* followed (i. e. *ṛ*+*ḷ*).

The reply अन्यतरस्मि[न्] तत् प्राप्नोत्येव is not very clear. It probably means that whether intended by the two *Vār.*-s or not, the triad (plus प्रकृतिभाव) does result in any one evironment (अन्यतरस्मिन्), once *sāvarṇya* is granted to *ṛ* and *ḷ*. There is no escape from it.

1. For this meaning, cf. the *Mbh.* which follows soon afterwards : अपि च ऋकारग्रहणेन ऌकारग्रहणं संनिहितं भवति.

Observations : We have tried to translate and explain the *Dīp.* in this section as best as we could. But certain parts of the text have remained somewhat obscure to us, and so also certain arguments. The difficulty is aggravated by the fact that the MS sometimes makes confusion between ऋ and ऌ (see below, in *Readings*, the differences between the two eds. in this matter). Another point is that Bhar., Kaiy. and Nāg. do not always see eye to eye. On the whole we think it necessary to underline following points :

(1) The whole discussion on *sāvarṇya* in the *Mbh.* starts from the expression होतृऌकार: होत्रृकार:. What is होतृऌकार: ? Kaiy. takes it as an असंहिता form. Bhar. here takes it as a compound (... ततश्च समासोऽयम्), but later on (*p.* 32, *l.* 18) under ततः ऌतीति he also speaks of एकमसंहिताविषयम् form. Nāg. rightly objects to the असंहिता interpretation, saying that an uninflected form is impossible outside a compound and that to take होतृ as Voc. sing. is equally clumsy. He therefore suggests that होतृऌकार: be taken as the starting point in the process, and not a finished form (समासे संहिता नित्या । असमासे त्वीदृशं रूपं दुर्लभं होतृशब्दे विभक्तिश्रवणापत्तेः । होतृशब्दस्य नपुंसके संबुद्धौ रूपमित्यप्यतिक्लिष्टमिति चिन्त्यम् । भाष्ये तु होतृऌकार इति दीर्घप्रवृत्तियोग्यदशोच्चारणम् । 'इति स्थिते' इति शेषः ।) We may add that on this view, it is wrong to read a Visarga after ऌकार. One must read होतृऌकार.

But there is one thing. By P. 6. 1. 128 : ऋत्यकः, absence of Saṁdhi is allowed here even in a compound. So होतृऌकार: (with visarga) can be looked upon as a case of प्रकृतिभाव (in the compound).

(2) In the positions concerned (*ṛ* + *ṛ*, and *ṛ* + *ḷ*), Bhar. often refers to 'three forms' ('त्रीणि रूपाणि', 'रूपत्रयम्', 'त्रैशब्द्यम्', 'त्रैरूप्यम्'). Kaiy. refers to 'two forms' (तत्रासंहितायामृकारे होतृऋकार इति रूपम् । संहितायामपि 'ऋत्यकः' इति शाकलप्रकृतिभावे एतदेव रूपम् । शाकलाभावे होतृकार: (i. e. होत्(ऋ)ऋकार:) होतॄकार इति रूपद्वयम्[1] । ऌकारेऽसंहितायां, संहितायां च शाकले, होतृऌकार इति । शाकलाभावे होतृकारो होतॢकार (i. e. होत्ऌ (ऌ)ऌकार) इति रूपद्वयम् ।). The disagreement between the two is more apparent than real. When Bhar. speaks of 'three forms' he is including प्रकृतिभाव/असंहिता form, while Kaiy. ignores it, since it is going to be there in any case.

The 'three forms', then, are : (1) प्रकृतिभाव (absence of Saṁdhi), (2) *ṝ* (both in *ṛ* + *ṛ* and also in *ṛ* + *ḷ*), and (3) (*r*)*ṛ* or (*l*)*ḷ* as the case may be, i. e. (*r*)*ṛ* in *ṛ* + *ṛ*, and (*l*)*ḷ* in *ṛ* + *ḷ* — depending on which of the two vowels follows. This seems to be fairly certain as far as the *Mbh.* is concerned.

---

1. ईषत्स्पृष्टघटितं विवृतदीर्घघटितं चेति भावः ।

(3) Whereas Kāt. and Pat. seem to be interested in only the two situations ṛ + ṛ, and ṛ + ḷ, Bhar. pursuing the *savarṇasaṁjñā* view, considers even the case ḷ + ḷ (*samānaviṣaya* as he calls it) and points out that in this situation (as also in ṛ + ṛ) both forms will result simultaneously (as a logical consequence of the *savarṇasaṁjñā*): not (*r*)ṛ or (*l*)ḷ as previously, but both (*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ. However, the specific expression 'four forms' (चत्वारि रूपाणि, or रूपचतुष्टयम् etc.) nowhere occurs.

It is noteworthy that Kaiy. is silent on this point although the subject had been already opened by Bhar.

(4) Nāg. has gone one step further and opened the question of long ṝ (in situations like ṝ + ṛ/ḷ). Further, Bhar. had not said anything about the desirability or otherwise of (*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ resulting in other than the originally intended situations [(*r*)ṛ in ṛ + ṛ; (*l*)ḷ in ṛ + ḷ]. Naturally, he says nothing about how to prevent them, if they were undesirable. Nāg., however, is clear and definite on this point. He says that whenever an extension of these two forms to other situations results from the *savarṇasaṁjñāvidhi* (or even from the two *Vār.*-s specifically teaching these two substitutes), the undesired forms are to be avoided by prohibiting the operation of the rule concerned by invoking *anabhidhāna* (or *vyavasthitavibhāṣā*). ('सिद्धान्तेऽपि [=यथास्थितवार्त्तिकपाठेऽपि] व्यवस्थितविभाषया, अनभिधानेन वा, होतृऌकारे पूर्ववार्त्तिकं गम्ऌऌकारे चोत्तरवार्त्तिकं न प्रवर्तते। एवं कॄ इति दीर्घस्य ऋकारे परे पूर्वस्य, तस्यैव ऌकारे उत्तरस्य चाप्रवृत्तिस्तत एवेति भाव:' under the *Mbh.* यदेतत् सवर्णदीर्घत्वे ऋतीति ... etc.). Similarly: अत्र पक्षेऽपि (= सावर्ण्यविधानपक्षेऽपि) उक्तयुक्त्या ह्रस्वऋकारद्वयस्थानिकदीर्घैकादेशातिरिक्तविषये आद्यस्य [i. e. of (ॣ)ऋ] ह्रस्वऋकारऌकारद्वयस्थानिकदीर्घैकादेशातिरिक्तविषये द्वितीयस्य [i. e. of (ल)ऌ] न साधुत्वमिति नातिप्रसङ्ग: पक्षयोस्तुल्यफलता चेति बोध्यम्।)

(5) The objection raised in the *Dīp.*, while discussing the *savarṇasaṁjñā* alternative, against the two substitutes ṝ and (*r*)ṛ presenting themselves simultaneously, in the context ṛ + ṛ thus resulting into an optionality of these forms, is a new point.

(i) The objector claims that neither of the two has a hundred percent affinity with the originals. If ṝ has *vivṛta* effort in common with the two originals, it does not consist of two *r*- consonants. On the other hand, if (*r*)ṛ contains two *r*- consonants, it does not have the *vivṛta* effort. You have to make your choice. You will have either this or that. But not both optionally.

(ii) A curious feature about this *Dīp.* is that there is no reply to this objection in the following text. Are we to suppose that this is Bhar.'s own view, which means that he differs from Pat.? Or does it suggest that a part of the *Dīp.* which possibly contained a reply to the objection is somehow lost? We keep the question open.

(iii) We do not think that the objection is reasonable. We do not think that either of the two alternatives can exclude the other in this case. Out of the many prospective alternative substitutes, only that which has a perfect affinity with the original can permanently rule out others which may have only a partial affinity. When, however, as in the present case, all the substitutes have only a partial affinity with the original, that is rather a good reason for allowing all substitutes optionally.

(iv) Neither Kaiy. nor Nāg. has taken any such objection. Read Kaiy. : द्वयोर्ॠकारयो रेफद्वययुक्तत्वाद् विवृतत्वाच्च कदाचिद् रेफद्वययुक्त ऋ [i. e. (र्)ऋ] भवति, कदाचिद् विवृत ऋकारः.

(6) Finally, the *Dīp.*, as it is, seems to confirm its enunciation : अयमिह तु भिन्न एव व्यापारः. So, according to Bhar., the question किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः is not justified. Kaiy. has not seriously considered this point, while Nāg. thinks that the question can stand, with the proviso of *anabhidhāna* or *vyavasthitavibhāṣā*.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 24) ऌकारस्य लपरत्वं वक्ष्यामि. The question raised above (viz. किं पुनरत्र ज्यायः ?) is thus answered in the *Mbh.* which immediately follows : सवर्णसंज्ञावचनमेव ज्यायः। दीर्घत्वं चैव हि सिद्धं भवति। अपि च ऋकारग्रहणेन ऌकारग्रहणं संनिहितं भवति। 'ऋत्यकः' खट्वऋष्यः, मालऋष्यः। इदमपि सिद्धं भवति — खट्वऌकारो मालऌकार इति। The *Mbh.* here points out that the *savarṇasaṁjñāvidhāna* alternative is to be preferred, for apart from providing a long substitute[1] (the main aim) it also provides for such forms as खट्वऌकारः (from खट्वाऌकारः). The rule ऋत्यकः (P. 6. 1. 128), which is strictly for *prakṛtibhāva* and shortening in the situation $ak+\underset{\circ}{r}$, can now, with the declaration of *sāvarṇya* between ṛ and ḷ, apply when ḷ also follows. Hence खट्वऌकारः. — At this the opponent immediately objects : यदि तर्हि ऋकारग्रहणेन ऌकारग्रहणं संनिहितं भवति ('if ḷ also is available when ṛ is read), 'उरण् रपरः' ऌकारस्यापि रपरत्वं प्राप्नोति। This *savarṇagrahaṇa* is not an unmixed blessing. If it is useful here, it can be inconvenient elsewhere. For instance, by the rule उरण् रपरः, a *r* will invariably follow an *aṇ* substitute which replaces not only ṛ, but which replaces ḷ also. From उपऌकारीयति, the resulting form will be उपर्कारीयति (nor उपल्कारीयति as desired).

The *Mbh.* ऌकारस्य लपरत्वं वक्ष्यामि is the reply to this objection. When *l*-suffixion is specifically taught, it will supersede *r*-suffixion resulting from *sāvarṇya*.

The *Dīp.* व्याख्यास्यामीत्यर्थः etc. explains the *modus operandi.* According to the *Dīp.* it consists in coining a new प्रत्याहार, i. e. र. For this purpose, the letter *a* in the Sū. *laṇ* is to be regarded as nasal which will give it the status of *it*

1. Both (*r*)ṛ and (*l*)ḷ, and also ṝ, are meant.

(P. 1. 3. 2). When *r* of the Sū. *hayavarat* is read along with this *a*, the *pratyāhāra* thus formed — *ra* (supposed to be *ra̐*) — will convey *l* also along with *r* (P. 1. 1. 71). In *ur aṇ raparaḥ* (P. 1. 1. 51), *ra-* in *raparaḥ* is to be understood as the *pratyāhāra ra*. That will therefore include *l* also. By *sāvarṇya*, *ṛ* already conveys *ḷ* also. Therefore उरण् रपरः finally means: An *aṇ* phoneme, which replaces *ṛ* and *ḷ*, is invariably followed by *r* and *l*.

(*p.* 33, *l.* 27) एवमप्युभयो रलौ ... etc. An objection against the above suggestion of the *ra pratyāhara* and the reply to it. The objection is: what prevents *aṇ* from being followed by both *r* and *l* whether that *aṇ* replaces *ṛ* or *ḷ*? उभयोः=उभयोरणोः, ऋस्थानिकस्य ऌस्थानिकस्य च. Scil. परौ as adj. to रलौ.

आन्तरतम्यात् is the reply. रेफवतः = ऋकारस्य. रेफवान्=अण्+र्. लकारवतः=ऌकारस्य. लकारवान्=अण्+ल्. The *Dīp.* यथा जश्भाविनां जशः supplies a parallel from reduplication. P. 8. 4. 54: अभ्यासे चर् च teaches *jaś* and *car* as substitutes for *jhal* consonants figuring in reduplication. But that does not mean that every *jhal* consonant in reduplication is replaced by both a *jaś* and by a *car*. There is a certain distribution: A part of the *jhal* group, viz. *jhaś* is replaced by *jaś* while the other part, viz. *khay* is replaced by *car*. What determines this distribution? Nearmostness or maximum affinity (*āntaratamya*), consisting of the presence or the absence of voicing. The same factor works here also.

Observation: As far as we know, Bhar. was the first to conceive the idea of the *pratyāhāra* '*ra*'. The *Mbh.* does not mention it anywhere. Kaiy. follows Bhar. Read: लपरत्वमिति। व्याख्यास्यामीत्यर्थः। 'रपरः' इत्यत्र र इति लणिति लकाराकारेण प्रत्याहार आश्रीयते। तत्रान्तरतम्यादृकारस्याण् रपरः, ऌकारस्य लपरः। Similarly the *Kāś.* (हकारादिष्वकार उच्चारणार्थः, नानुबन्धः। लकारे त्वनुनासिकः प्रतिज्ञायते, तेन 'उरण् रपरः' इत्यत्र प्रत्याहारग्रहणाल्लपरत्वमपि भवति।) and the *Sid-Kau.* (इति माहेश्वराणि सूत्राण्यणादिसंज्ञार्थानि। एषामन्त्या इतः। लण्सूत्रेऽकारश्च।).

Nāg. however opposes this suggestion on the ground of separate mention of both *r* and *l* in P. 7. 2. 2: अतोर्लान्तस्य. He concludes: तस्मादपूर्वं वचनं कार्यम् (viz. something like ऌकारस्य लपरः after उरण् रपरः) इत्येव भाष्याशय उचित इत्याहुः।

(*p.* 34, *l.* 1) प्रक्लृप्यमानमिति. The opponent takes an objection against the *savarṇasaṁjñāvidhāna*. If there is *sāvarṇya* between the two, then cerebralization of *n* taught after *ṛ* will undesiredly become due after *ḷ* also, e. g. in *kḷpyamāna* (इह तर्हि 'रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे' इत्यृकारग्रहणं चोदितं मातॄणां पितॄणामित्यर्थम्। तदिहापि प्राप्नोति—क्लृप्यमानं पश्येति *Mbh.*). The protagonist of the *savarṇasaṁjñā* retorts: अथासत्यामपि सवर्णसंज्ञायामिह कस्मान्न भवति — प्रक्लृप्यमानं पश्येति? How do you prevent, on your part, cerebralization in प्रक्लृप्यमान which has nothing to do with the name *savarṇa*? Here also cerebralization is due by P. 8. 4. 29: ('कृत्स्थो यो नकारोऽच उत्तरस्तस्योपसर्गस्थान्निमित्तादुत्तरस्य णकारादेशो भवति'

Kāś.)? This will be a difficulty for the opponent also and whatever way he finds out, that will be used by the *savarṇasaṁjñāvādin* also.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 3) त्रिभिश्च मध्यमैरिति. The above challenge is thus met by the opponent in the *Mbh.* : 'चुटुतुलशर्व्यवाये न' इति वक्ष्यामि। He means to say that he will read this prohibitory rule (instead of P. 8. 1. 2 : अट्कुप्वाङ्नुम्व्यवायेऽपि). Since *ḷ* contains *l* which intervenes between *r* (of *pra-*) and *n* (of *-kḷpyamāna*), there is no cerebralization. The *Mbh.* continues: अपर आह — 'त्रिभिश्च मध्यमैर्वर्गैर्लशसैश्च व्यवाये न', इति वक्ष्यामि. Since this statement practically means the same thing as चुटुतु ... etc., the *Dīp.* asks : कोऽत्र विशेषः?

The first statement contains the *pratyāhāra śar*. It includes *ṣ* also. But far from hindering *ṇ* substitution, it is actually a cause of it (P. 8. 4. 1). So although included in *śar.*, it is to be inferred (अनुमीयते) that its inclusion is not intended. The statement thus is defective. In the second one (त्रिभिश्च मध्यमैः ... etc.), this defect is avoided by not using the *pratyāhāra* and reading *ś* and *s* directly.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 5) ननु लकारव्यवाय ... etc. The objector points out that the difficulty still persists. The prohibition of *ṇ*-substitution is assured all right when *l* intervenes between *r* ... etc. and *n*. But how does it provide for this prohibition when *ḷ* intervenes, with which we are here concerned? The protagonist of the *savarṇasaṁjñā* therefore draws his attention to the *Mbh.* वर्णैकदेशा वर्णग्रहणेन गृह्यन्ते (which maxim the objector either does not know, or knowing it, he seems to have forgotten it)[1].

The *Dīp.* समुदायव्यापारे ... etc. provides a logical argument supporting the maxim वर्णैकदेशाश्च. (Similarly Kaiy. : अवयवस्य स्वव्यापारानिवर्तनात्।)

Here Kaiy. adds a point on which Bhar. is silent. What is the solution on the अग्रहणपक्ष, i. e. for one who does not accept the maxim? अग्रहणपक्षे तु (says Kaiy.) क्षुभ्नादेराकृतिगणत्वाण्णत्वाभावः। Nāg. expands on this thus : प्रक्लृप्यमानमिति क्लृप्यमानमित्यत्र चेति भावः। आद्ये 'कृत्यचः' इति, द्वितीये 'ऋवर्णान्नस्य' इति। So, if the opponent resorts to the prohibition taught for *kṣubhnādi* words in order to defend प्रक्लृप्यमानम् (without *ṇ* substitution), the *savarṇasaṁjñāvādin* also can take shelter there to justify the form क्लृप्यमानम्.

(*p.* 34, *l.* 7) यद्येवम्, नार्थो ... etc. The *Mbh.* represented by this *pratīka* runs thus : यद्येवम्, नार्थो रषाभ्यां णत्वे ऋकारग्रहणेन। वर्णैकदेशाश्च वर्णग्रहणेन गृह्यन्त इति योऽसौ ऋकारे रेफस्तदाश्रयं णत्वं भविष्यति। The *savarṇasaṁjñāvādin* presses his point by pointing to one incidental advantage which will result if his alternative is accepted. In that case the addition of a statement ऋकाराच्च (नकारस्य

1. For the discussion on this maxim, see the *Mbh.* on the 'Śiva-Sū. एओङ्। ऐऔच्। (the *Mahābhāṣya-Dīpikā*, Āhn. II, *p.* 21, *ll.* 13 ff.)

णत्वम्) will not be necessary after P. 8. 4. 1 : रषाभ्यां नो णः ... etc. to secure *ṇ*-substitution in *mātṝṇām* etc. The maxim वर्णैकदेशाश्च ... will take care of it.

The *Dīp.* एवं च सति (*l.* 8) ... carries the argument further. एवं च सति = ऋकारस्थं रेफमाश्रित्य णत्वे सिद्धे. अगृह्यमाणं refers to ऋकारग्रहणम्. So a तत् is to be understood before कथं.

The opponent had said that if *sāvarṇya* between *ṛ* and *ḷ* is accepted, then *ṇ*-substitution (which is taught after *ṛ* by 'ऋकाराच्च') will now have to be extended undesiredly after *ḷ* in क्लृप्यमानम्. But, says the *savarṇasaṁjñāvādin*, since now ऋकाराच्च is dispensed with and *ṇ*-substitution is accounted for by रषाभ्यां नो णः ... itself (buttressed by वर्णैकदेशाः ... गृह्यन्ते), there is no danger of *ṇ*-substitution in क्लृप्यमानम् even if ऋकारऌकारयोः सावर्ण्यम् is accepted. So the laying down of *sāvarṇya* stands (इति स्थिता सवर्णसंज्ञा).

एवं सत्यक्षरसमाम्नाये (*l.* 10) ... etc. Two conclusions are drawn, *prima facie* in the *Dīp.* from the above discussion : (1) It is not necessary to read *ḷ* in the alphabet (अनर्थक ऌकारोपदेशः). (2) There will be a confusion in the function of the code-letters *ṛ* and *ḷ* after roots. Whatever is taught in connection with the code-letter *ṛ* (e. g. prohibition of the shortening of the radical vowel taught by P. 7. 4. 2 : नाग्लोपि°) will have to be executed in the case of the code-letter *ḷ* also. These conclusions are refuted in the following *Dīp.*

This part of the *Dīp.* is evidently damaged. The words पृथगनुबन्ध... नाङ्झलौ occur twice, first after प्राप्नोति, and then at the proper place, while some words are possibly missing. After making the necessary adjustments the text would read as following (with the lost words supplied in rectangular brackets) : ऋदिति तर्हि यदुच्यते, तत् ऌदिति अत्रापि प्राप्नोति। [नैतदस्ति। यदि हि संकरः स्यात्, पृथगनुबन्धकरणमनर्थकं स्यात्।] न भविष्यति [अनर्थकम्]। अङर्थं तु ... etc.

This, then, is the line of argument :

The objector claims that because of *sāvarṇya* there will be a confusion of operations; those which are taught in connection with the code-letter *ṛ* will also apply, undesiredly, where the code-letter *ḷ* is used.

The reply given is that there will be no such confusion. For, if there was going to be such confusion — and if it was intended by him — Pāṇini would not have used two separate code-letters (*ṛ* and *ḷ*); he would have used only *ṛ*, which would have the same result. The reading of the additional code-letter *ḷ* would become superfluous on the hypothesis of confusion (नैतदस्ति। यदि ... अनर्थकं स्यात्)[1].

---

1. For this argument which we have supplied, cf. a similar situation in the *Mbh.* Āhn. II : 'अनुबन्धसंकरस्तु' (वा. ६)। अनुबन्धसंकरस्तु (= अनुबन्धकार्यसंकरस्तु) प्राप्नोति।

(*Continued on the next page*)

No, replies the objector. The additional code-letter *ḷ* does not become superfluous on the hyphthesis of confusion. (It is not inconsistent with it.) It has still a purpose to serve viz. to indicate *aṅ* as an Aor. tense-marker. So reading of both the code-letters does not necessarily suggest that there will be no confusion (न भविष्यति [अनर्थकं] । अङर्थं तु ऌदित्वं स्यात् ।).

' There you are ', says the Siddhāntin. Now you are caught. The code-letter *ḷ* is necessary for securing *aṅ*. Now *ḷ* (comprehended by *ṛ* on the basis of *sāvarṇya*) cannot get this capacity of indicating *aṅ* from *ṛ*, since *ṛ* itself does not have it. Therefore *ḷ* has to be read in the alphabet, to which the code-letters can refer. (तस्मात् ऌकारः प्रत्याहारे पठितव्यः ।). That is one thing.

Secondly, once *ḷ* is thus included in the alphabet, it follows that because this reading and of the mention of *ḷ* in P. 3. 1. 55, there will be no confusion of operations taught for the code-letter *ṛ* and *ḷ* (पठ्यमाने तस्मिन् पृथगनुबन्धकरणसामर्थ्याद् भवति परिहारः ।). Kaiy. observes : ऋदितां ऌदितां च भेदेनानुबन्धनिर्देशात् (ओणृ गम्ऌ इत्यादौ), भेदेन चोपादानात् (' नाग्लोपिशास्वृदिताम् ' ' पुषादिद्युताद्यॢदितः ' इति च) अनुबन्धकार्येषु परस्परग्रहणाभावात् संकराभावः ।

Readings : (1) (*p.* 32, 3) MS ऋकारल्कारयोः — (2) (*p.* 32, *l.* 4) MS [अ]भिधेया (for वि°). — (3) (*p.* 32, *l.* 6) MS Sw कर्तव्यो. — (4) (*p.* 32, *l.* 7) AL (अर्थ)प्रदर्शनम्. — (5) (*p.* 32, *l.* 10) The Ed. does not read इति after प्रयोजनम्. — (6) (*p.* 32, *l.* 11) MS AL Sw न (for our emendation तेन). — (7) (*p.* 32, *l.* 12) Sw दीर्घो नास्ति (for दीर्घा न सन्ति). — (8) (*p.* 32, *l.* 14) MS -संज्ञावि°. — (9) (*p.* 32, *l.* 14) AL [ए]तद् (for तद्). — (10) (*p.* 32, *l.* 16) MS भवतीति (for ऋतीति). — (11) (*p.* 32, *l.* 18) MS ऌकारे (for ऋ°). — (12) (*p.* 32, *l.* 20) MS सवर्णो. — (13) (*p.* 32, *l.* 23) AL अनच्कत्वम्. — (14) (*p.* 32, *l.* 23) MSSw रेफावध्ये(Sw °ध्ये)वचाङमात्र; AL रेफौ अर्धावच अङ्मात्र. — (15) (*p.* 32, *l.* 24) MSSw तुरीथावध्यवचा(Sw °त्वा)ङ्मात्रे(Sw °त्रो); AL तुरीयाधिकौ अङ्मात्रः. — (16) (*p.* 32, *l.* 25) Sw ल्कारश्च (for ऋका°). — (17) (*p.* 33 *l.* 1) MS लइप्यते; AL लप्स्यते (for लभ्यते). — (18) (*p.* 33, *l.* 4) इष्यते is our suggestion for उन्यते of the MS (also in the eds.). — (19) (*p.* 33, *l.* 6) Sw अ(प्यच्)त्वं. — (20) (*p.* 33, *l.* 10) AL om. इह. — (21) (*p.* 33, *l.* 11) AL तत (for न तद्). — (22) (*p.* 33, *l.* 11) AL ऌति ऌ- (for ऋति ऋ-). — (23) (*p.* 33, *l.* 11) AL होतृ-ऌकार. — (24) (*p.* 33, *l.* 11) MSAL स्थितं (MS °त). — (25) Sw उपस्थितोर्. — (26) (*p.* 33, *l.* 12) MS Sw रे (MS र)फैर्द्विणाशेन; AL रेफयोर्विनाशेन (for our emendation रेफयोर्द्विरेफेण). — (27) (*p.* 33, *l.* 16) MS

(*Continued from the last page*)

' कर्मण्यण् ' ' आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः ' इति केऽपि णित्कृतं प्राप्नोति । ··· ' विषयेण तु नानालिङ्गकरणात् सिद्धम् ' (वा. ९) । यदयं विषये विषये नानालिङ्गमकारं करोति ' कर्मण्यण् ' ' आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः ' इति, तेन ज्ञायते — नानुबन्धसंकरोऽस्तीति । यदि हि स्यात्, नानालिङ्गकरणमनर्थकं स्यात् । एकमेवायं सर्वगुणमुच्चारयेत् ।

यर्थापेषा; Sw यथा येषा(?) (for पर्यायेण). — (28) (*p.* 33, *l.* 16) MSSw दोष: (for दीर्घ:). See Notes.—(29) (*p.* 33. *l.* 17) MS AL तथैवं (AL °व).—(30) (*p.* 33, *l.* 18) Both eds. put a *daṇḍa* after त्वन्यत्, thus making तस्मात् the initial word of the next sentence. See Notes. — (31) (*p.* 33, *l.* 19) MS विधत्; AL विधत्ते (for विद्धत्). — (32) (*p.* 33, *l.* 19) Sw विद्धाति? एवं ऋ (for °धात्येव, (ऌ)ऌ). — (33) (*p.* 33, *l.* 20) ALSw ऌ(Sw ऌ ऌ)तीति ऌकार: (for ऋ ऋतीति ऌ°).— (34) (*p.* 33, *l.* 21) AL Sw ऋतीति (for ऌतीति). — (35) (*p.* 33, *l.* 21) MS reads प्राप्नोति। स्याद् ... भागोपादानसा twice. — (36) (*p.* 33, *l.* 24) AL प्रत्याहार:. — (37) (*p.* 33, *l.* 25) MSSw अत(:) स्वेनान्येनेतरदिति; AL अत: स्वेनान्येन इतर: इत इति. See Notes for our suggestion. — (38) (*p.* 33, *l.* 26) MS AL तन्मध्यस्य. Sw adds [अ]पि after this. — (39) (*p.* 33, *l.* 27) MS AL तन्मध्यं. — (40) (*p.* 34, *l.* 1) MS ऌप्यणमिति; AL क्लृप्यमानं (पश्य) इति; Sw क्लृप्य(मा)नमिति. — (41) (*p.* 34, *ll.* 11 ff) For the omissions and additions in the MS, see Notes. — AL read (किं) न भविष्यति at the beginning of the *Dīp.* on the next Sū. नाज्झलौ.

* * *

P. 1. 1. 10 : *nāj-jhalau*

[1]

The *Dīp.* इकारशकारयो: ... etc. introduces the *Vār.* 1. This is the situation: The preceding rule (P. 1. 1. 9) says that the phonemes which have a similar place of articulation and a similar manner — what is called an 'inner effort'—of articulation, are named *savarṇa* 'homogeneous' with one another. If that rule is not further restricted, then a vowel *a* for instance will have to be named 'homogeneous' with a consonant *h* because both have *kaṇṭha* as the place of articulation and *vivṛta* as their *prayatna*; and similarly *i* and *ś* (both palatal and *vivṛta*). As this 'homogeneousness' is not desired between vowels and consonants (as it will lead to undesired results), Pāṇini prohibits it in the present rule. But it now so happens that although useful on the whole, Kāt. thinks that this prohibition will perhaps create difficulty in the case of *śś* (two consecutive *ś*-s). By the rule of 'comprehension of the homogeneous', both the two *ś* sounds can be looked upon as *i* and *ś* as well. Under these circumstances, when homogeneousness is prohibited by the present rule, we cannot delete the preceding *ś* (which requires a *savarṇa* to follow. For details see below). Therefore he proposes to exclude *śś* from the operation of P. 1. 1. 10 in his *Vār.* अज्झलो: प्रतिषेधे ... etc.

In *l.* 15 supply सावर्ण्यं प्राप्तम् इति (or some such words) after तुल्ये इति. In *l.* 16 we have supplied न (before भवत:) which seems necessary. The eds. construe the text differently but, we are afraid, not very happily.

(*p*. 34, *l*. 18) In the *Vār*., नच्त्वात् of the MS is very likely a scribal error for ऽज्झल्त्वात्. The *Dīp*. after this, which is quite corrupt, is read by us as अज्झला-वच्त्वात् [हल्त्वा]च्चाशक्यौ. For the readings of the eds., see below under *Readings*.

Here the *Dīp*. is showing how अज्झलोः प्रतिषेध of the *Vār*. is to be interpreted. The *Vār*. literally means : ' When *ac* and *hal* are prohibited ' or ' in the matter of prohibition of *ac* and *hal* '. Further, अज्झल्त्वात् is likely to be taken as the reason for अज्झलोः प्रतिषेध. The *Dīp*. points out that this is obviously impossible. It is not *ac* and *hal* that are prohibited on the ground of *ajjhaltva*. It is really the designation *savarṇa*, the property under discussion (प्राकरणिको धर्मः) which has become due for *ac* and *hal*, that is being prohibited on the strength of *ajjhaltva*.

अथ वा प्रतिषेधेन (*l*. 20) ... is an alternative explanation where *nivṛtti* can be directly construed with *ajjhaloḥ*. The *Dīp*. अज्झलोः सवर्णसंज्ञातो निवृत्तौ is a paraphrase of the *Vār*. अज्झलोः प्रतिषेधे.

The expression शकारप्रतिषेधः also (*ca*) is subjected to two alternative interpretations in the *Dīp*. In the first, शकारप्रतिषेधः (= शकारयोः सावर्ण्यप्रतिषेधः) is furnished with a predicate प्राप्नोति. The suggestion is that something should be done to prevent it (तदर्थो यत्नः कर्तव्यः). In the second, शकारप्रतिषेधः itself is the predicate : ' phoneme *ś* should be excluded ' (from the operation of P. 1. 1.10).

यद्यप्येकवचनान्तस्य समासः (*l*. 23) i. e. from a strictly technical point of view. The सामर्थ्य consists in the relative term homogeneity requiring more than one object.

(*p*. 34, *l*. 25) अच्चैव हि शकारो ... etc. The *hal* status of *ś* is self-evident while its *ac*-status requires an explanation. Hence the query (कथं तावदच्त्वम् ?) and a reply to it. The reply is of course based on the सवर्णग्रहण (*Mbh*.) which expression is explained in two ways in the *Dīp*. (1) सवर्णस्य ग्रहणम् (paraphrased by ग्रहीति) and (2) सवर्णः गृह्यते अनेन इति, i. e. the rule अणुदित्सवर्णस्य ... (P. 1. 1. 69). For the variant readings, see *Readings* below.

The process how *i* comprehends *ś*, the effect of this *sāvarṇya*, viz. the *savarṇagrahaṇa*, the consequent *ac*-status of *ś*, the loss of *sāvarṇya* between the two *ś* sounds (by P. 1. 1. 10), the undesired forms it can lead to where there are two consecutive *ś* sounds, and finally the *Vār*. 1 which seeks to exempt the sequence *śś* from the operation of the present prohibitory rule (1. 1. 10) have been already set out at the beginning above. Still we repeat it here, step by step for the sake of ready reference :

1. सावर्ण्य between *i* and *ś* (because of तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्व) by P. 1. 1. 9.
2. Comprehension of *ś* by *i* by P. 1. 1. 69 (सवर्णग्रहण).

3. Hence the (secondary) *ac* status of *ś*.

4. Prohibition of सावर्ण्य between *ac* and *hal* by P. 1. 1. 10.

5. So the prohibition of सावर्ण्य between *ś* (secondary *ac*) and *ś* (*hal*).

6. Non-availability of deletion of the first *ś* by P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे owing to the absence of सावर्ण्य.

7. Hence the *Vār.* stressing the need to exclude the case of *śś* from the operation of P. 1. 1. 10 (at stage 4).

So far, the enunciation of the *pūrvapakṣa*.

[1. 1]

(*p.* 35, *l.* 3) कथं पुन: इकार: शकारं गृह्णाति ... etc. Now an objection is raised against the above *pūrvapakṣa*, the reply to which extends up to ईकारस्य शकारे परत इति (*p.* 35, *l.* 26). The objection is of the मूले कुठार: type. The whole chain of arguments of the *pūrvapakṣa* starts from the assumption इकार: सवर्णग्रहणेन शकारं गृह्णाति. The objector points out that the very Sū. which we are discussing : नाज्झलौ (P. 1. 1. 10), that itself prohibits the *sāvarṇya* between *ac* and *hal*. So कथं पुन: इकार: शकारं गृह्णाति ? — he thunders. It is obvious that when there is no *sāvarṇya* between *i* and *ś*, there is no comprehension (*savarṇagrahaṇa*) of *ś* by *i*. So there is no *ac* status for *ś*. That means there is no *ac* : *hal* confrontation in *śś*. So there is no prohibition of homogeneity between *śś*. So the whole structure of the *pūrvapakṣa* stumbles down. Since there is no possibility of the loss of *sāvarṇya* in *śś* by P. 1. 1. 10, the *Vār.* which seeks to maintain that *sāvarṇya* by exempting this environment *śś* from the operation of P. 1. 1. 10 is superfluous.

[1. 1. 1]

(*p.* 35, *l.* 5) उच्यते .. etc. The reply (on behalf of the *Vār.*) begins here. It consists of two parts : (1) (*p.* 35, *ll.* 5–18) Examination of a part of the subject of this rule, viz. *ac*, with a view to deciding its exact denotation, and (2) (*p.* , 35 *ll.* 19–26) examining the possibility of applying the negation, the predicate of this rule, to the particular case *śś* (i. e. secondarily *iś*).

It may be noted here in advance that while the second part denies the application of the prohibition (P. 1. 1. 10) to *ac* and *hal* in the present rule itself, on the ground that the prohibition is yet to be accomplished, the first one maintains that even if the prohibition were to apply, *ac* of P. 1. 1. 10 cannot include the secondary *i* (= *ś*), i. e. the prohibition will not apply in the present case (i. e. to *śś*). In any case, therefore, the *Vār.* is necessary.

I. 'ac' in P. 1. 1. 10 does not include a secondary i (i. e. ś)

Admitting obviously for the time being that the prohibition of *sāvarṇya* applies to *ac* used in P. 1. 1. 10 also, the *pūrvapakṣa* (the advocate of the *Vār.*) raises the question as to the exact content of the term *ac* here : Does it denote only phonemes included in the alphabet from *a* up to *c* (i. e. *a, i, u, ṛ, ḷ, e, o, ai,* and *au*) as provided by P. 1. 1. 71 or does it denote, in addition, their homogeneous consonants also on the strength of *savarṇagrahaṇa* laid down in P. 1. 1. 69 (अज् ... किं गृहीतसवर्णकानां [संज्ञा] अथ न)?

The opponent (the objector) naturally replies that *ac* here includes the secondary *ac*, i. e. consonants also apprehended on the basis of homogeneity. (Because when the homogeneity between a secondary *i* (i. e. *ś*) and *ś* is denied by P. 1. 1. 10 itself, the *Vār.* meant for *śś* becomes superfluous.) To support his claim he cites the case of P. 6. 1. 101 : अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः where *ak* denotes not only *a, i ...* etc. but also *ā, ī* etc. by *savarṇagrahaṇa* (गृहीतसवर्णकानामिति ... इत्यस्मिन् ग्रहणे).

Incidentally, we supply *acām* as a substantive for the adj. गृहीतसवर्णकानाम् and add संज्ञा to complete the sense.

इह तु नास्ति ग्रहणम् (*p.* 35, *l.* 7) etc. is the reply given by the *pūrvapakṣin* in support of the *Vār.* According to him, *savarṇagrahaṇa* cannot function here. It requires certain preliminaries to be completed, particularly the ascertainment of the 'homogeneous' phonemes. This latter phase is still in process (अपरिनिष्पन्नत्वात् or क्रियमाणत्वात् संज्ञासंज्ञिसंबन्धस्य). Until the *savarṇa*-s are fixed the rule (P. 1. 1. 69) which sanctions their comprehension by *aṇ* does not itself come into existence (अनभिनिर्वृत्तत्वात्). A rule which is still in the embryonic stage cannot obviously function prematurely here (in P. 1. 1. 10) and arm the expression *ac* occuring here with power of *savarṇagrahaṇa*. So in P. 1. 1. 10 *ac* means primarily *ac* sounds (*a, i, u*...[*c*]); it does not include the secondarily *ac* sounds like *ś*. Since the *sāvarṇya* (resulting by P. 1. 1. 9) between this secondary *i* (= *ś*) and *hal* is not prohibited by P. 1. 1. 10, *śś* is as good as *iś*. This results into the application of P. 1. 1. 10 to *śś*, thus destroying its *sāvarṇya*. To prevent this the *Vār.* is necessary.

Observation : Some part of this *Dīp.* is apparently corrupt. We have suggested some emendations. They may perhaps appear to be too drastic or radical. We are prepared to drop them if it is shown that the desired meaning can be had without them. They are : (1) सावर्ण्यात् ग्रहणम्। सावर्ण्याभावे ग्रहणाभावः for ग्रहणात् ग्रहणे। ग्रहणाभावे (*p.* 35, *l.* 9), (2) ह्यज्ग्रहणे for ह्यण्ग्रहणे (*p.* 35, *l.* 11), and (3) चाज्ग्रहणे for चाण्ग्रहणे (*p.* 35, *l.* 19).

The *Dīp.* स्वात्मनि च क्रियाविरोधात् (*p.* 35, *l.* 11) requires an explanation in this context. The maxim is usually illustrated by such examples as the fire which burns others but cannot burn itself, the eye can see others but not itself and so on. In the *Dīp.* here, the *ātman* means the group of all related rules which form what is called a *mahāvākya*. In the present case, apart from the *upadeśa* (alphabet), the rules concerned are P. 1. 3. 3. : हलन्त्यम्, 1. 1. 71 : आदिरन्त्येन सहेता, 1. 1. 9 and 10 : तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम्। नाज्झलौ and, finally 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः (See the *Mbh.* further under *Vār.* 4 : वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेः।). Since the whole group froms a *mahāvākya* or one *ātman*, a part of it, viz. P. 1. 1. 69 cannot operate on another part viz. P. 1. 1. 10. *Svātmani kriyā virudhyate.* It can have its scope elsewhere, as in P. 6. 1. 101, only after it has found itself.

(*p.* 35, *l.* 13) एवं च कृत्वा ... etc Here the *Dīp.* cites another case from grammar where the maxim स्वात्मनि क्रिया विरुध्यते is involved and is pointed out as such by Kāt. himself. It concerns the rule P. 1. 3. 3 : हलन्त्यम् which says that a final *hal* (consonant) in the *upadeśa* is *it* (a code-letter). Here *hal* of course is intended to convey any phoneme read from *h* up to *l* (i. e., for our understanding, a consonant) in the alphabet (अक्षरसमाम्नाय). But how are we to know this ? This requires the knowledge that *hal* is a *pratyāhāra* (an abbreviation) ; this in its turn requires the knowledge that the final *l* is *it*. But how are we to know this ? For that again we have to turn to our rule *hal antyam* itself which thus involves an interdependence (अन्योन्याश्रय). P. 1. 3. 3 cannot be used here to convey the *it* status of its own part, i. e. *l*, because स्वात्मनि क्रिया विरुध्यते. Kāt. takes this objection to P. 1. 3. 3 in his *Vār.* 3 : लकारस्यानुबन्धाज्ञापितत्वात् ... etc. and suggestes that the name *it* be taught separately for *l* (तस्मात् पृथक् लकारस्येत्संज्ञा वक्तव्या). The *Dīp.* suggests that just as the rule *hal* itself cannot operate on its part *l* in order to declare its *it* status, similarly P. 1. 1. 69 cannot operate on *ac* of P. 1. 1. 10, a part of a common *mahāvākya*, in order to grant *savarṇagrahaṇa* to it.

Incidentally, the *Dīp.* refers to the following two *Vār.*-s (4 and 5) which suggest remedies. *Vār.* 4 : सिद्धं तु लकारनिर्देशात् says that the object will be achieved if *hal* is understood as equal to *hal-l* (where the final *l* is dropped in Saṁdhi). An alternative to this (taught in *Vār.* 5) is to regard *hal* as an *ekaśeṣa*, i. e. = *hāl* + *hal* where, as Kaiy. explains, the first *hal* is a Tatpuruṣa (*hasya l*), and the second a *pratyāhāra.*

Incidentally, the practice in the *SidKau.* tradition is first to understand *halantyam* as a Saptamī-Tatp. (हलि अन्त्यम्) which gives *it*- status to *l* of *hal* and then repeat the whole Sū. (which means अन्त्यं हल इत् स्यात्).

[1. 1. 2]

(*p.* 35, *l.* 19) यथैव चाज्ग्रहणे ... etc. Now the second part :

II. The prohibition does not apply to P. 1. 1. 10 itself.

The *pūrvapakṣin* so far showed that even if the prohibition were to apply to the present rule itself *ac* here would still continue to include a secondary *ac* (i. e. *i* = *ś*). But, he now shows that there is no possibility of the present prohibitory rule applying to *ac* in the present rule itself. The reasons are the same as in the first part : (1) This rule is not yet accomplished or come into existence. It is *anabhinirvṛtta*. So *ac* being still free from the effect of this prohibition continues to include the secondary *ac* (*i*=*ś*).

While commenting on the corresponding *Prad.* (स्वात्मनि क्रियाविरोधादस्मिन्नेव सूत्र इदं न व्याप्रियत इति सवर्णत्वनिषेध इकारशकारयोर्नास्ति, 'यस्येति च' इत्यादौ तु शकार इकारेण न गृह्यतेऽनेन सवर्णत्वनिषेधात्। इह तु स्वात्मनि व्यापारो नास्ति, अस्ति च पूर्वेण सवर्णत्वमिकारशकारयो:) Nāg. explains the technical point beautifully thus : स्वात्मनीति।... एतद्वाक्यार्थबोधोत्तरमन्यत्र निषेधेऽपि स्ववाक्यार्थबोधात् प्राक् स्वघटकपदार्थोपस्थितिवेलायां स्ववाक्यार्थबोधरूपसावर्ण्याभावज्ञानाभावान् नात्रेकारशकारयोस्तदभावबोधनमिति भावः।

The other two reasons, again as before, are : (2) शास्त्रान्तरं च नास्ति प्रतिषेधबोधकम् and (3) स्वात्मनि च क्रिया विरुद्धयते. Even the parallel, घटस्यात्मस्पर्शाभावः, is the same.

Observation : We are again constrained to suggest two more emendations. In *p*. 35, *l*. 25 we propose to read न instead of च of the MS (maintained in the eds.) and similarly add प्रतिषेध to सवर्णसंज्ञा (*l*. 26). The modifications are necessary to make the text agree with facts and to keep the *pūrvapakṣa* consistent : (1) In this Sū. itself, *sāvarṇya* between *i* and *ś* is not prohibited (according to the *Siddhāntin* as well as the *pūrvapakṣin*) — in fact that is the tenor of the *pūrvapakṣin* all along — and (2) between *ī* and *ś* also, e. g. in the sequence *kumārī śete*, the homogeneity is not desired by any party. — शकारयोः = इकारशकारयोः (by *savarṇagrahaṇa*).

[1. 2]

(*p*. 35, *l*. 27) ननु च प्रकल्प्य वापवादम् ... etc. Another objection against the *Vār*. As the Paribhāṣā says, a general rule takes care to apply to only such cases as will not be claimed by the exception. Such being the case P. 1. 1. 9, the *utsarga* rule, will not apply to *i* : *ś* since P. 1. 1. 10 which prohibits homogeneity between *ac* and *hal* is an *apavāda* rule. When there is no *sāvarṇya* (which was supposed to have been brought about by P. 1. 1. 9), what is the point in framing a *Vār*. to prevent it ?

The reply is again much the same : *utsarga* honours an *apavāda* when it has come into existence. As yet it is still in making. So the *utsarga* takes no cognizance of it.

प्रकल्प्य...प्रवर्तते is *Pari.* 63 in Nāg.'s work. Nāg. paraphrases there प्रकल्प्य by परित्यज्य. *Pari.* 62 in that work is : पूर्वं ह्यपवादा अभिनिविशन्ते, पश्चादुत्सर्गाः (Nāg. paraphrases अभिनिविशन्ते by बुद्ध्यारूढा भवन्ति).

Both these *Pari.*-s, which represent only slightly differing views about the the priority an exception enjoys over the general rule, are derived from the following passage which constantly recurs in the *Mbh.* : न चापवादविषय उत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते। पूर्वं ह्यपवादा अभिनिविशन्ते, पश्चादुत्सर्गाः। प्रकल्प्य वापवादविषयं तत उत्सर्गोऽभिनिविशते (*Mbh.* I. 462. 23 — 463. 3, under P. 2. 3. 43 etc.). Incidentally, since प्रकल्प्य वापवाद् ... is an alternative to the preceding पूर्वं ह्यपवादाः ... etc. the particle *vā* is explained.

(*p.* 36, *l.* 1) न चेदत्रापवादविषयः ... etc. Since *apavāda* is yet to come into being, the *utsarga* (P. 1. 1. 9) prevails. So *ac* in P. 1. 1. 10 means *a...c* and also consonants apprehended by them, like *ś*. So when P. 1. 1. 10 says that there is no homogeneity between *ac* and *hal*, it means that subsequently just as there will be no homogeneity between *i* and *ś*, it will similarly not be there between *ś* (i. e. secondary *i*) and *ś* also (इह प्रत्याहारे शकारस्याच्त्वेन ग्रहणादन्यत्र नास्ति सवर्णत्वेन ग्रहणम्).

The difficulty which follows from this, as already said, is that in the absence of homogeneity between two *ś*-s we cannot invoke the rule झरो झरि...to delete one *ś*. As a result a three-*ś* form results undesiredly. Hence the *Vār.* तत्र सवर्णलोपे दोषः.

(*p.* 36, *l.* 3) तत्र सवर्णलोपे दोषः. The drawback which results from the comprehension of *ś* by *i* on account of the *savarṇagrahaṇa* is illustrated in the *Mbh.* by the case of the word परश्शत (occurring, for example, in the expression परश्शतानि कार्याणि 'over a hundred things to be done').

The *Dīp.* शतादतिक्रान्तानि (*l.* 5) ... etc. gives the whole process of the formation of the compound परश्शत thus :

'शतादतिक्रान्तानि ... अधिकानि वा' इत्यर्थे —

शत+पर ('पञ्चमी ...' [P. 2. 1. 37] इति योगविभागात्, 'साधनं कृता' [P. 2. 1. 33, *Vār.* 2] इति वा समासः।)

पर+शत ('राजदन्तादित्वात् [P. 2. 2. 31) परनिपातः।']

परस्+शत ('पारस्करादित्वात् [P. 6. 1. 157] सुट्शब्दः।')

OR

शत+परस् ('परार्थो वा परस्-शब्दः।')

परस्+शत ('राजदन्तादित्वात् परनिपातः' as before)

then

परश्+शत ('स्तोः श्चुना श्चुः', P. 8. 4. 40)

परश्श्+शत ('अनचि च', P. 8. 4. 47)

परश् O +शत ('झरो झरि सवर्णे' P. 8. 4. 65)

Here the second *ś* can be optionally deleted by P. 8. 4. 65 because (coming after a *hal* viz. *ś*) it, itself a *jhar*, is followed by a homogeneous *jhar* (viz. the final *ś*). But if P. 1. 1. 10 prohibits this *sāvarṇya* P. 8. 4. 65 cannot apply. A two-*ś* form cannot be had. We get only a three-*ś* form (... सावर्ण्यस्य प्रतिषिद्धत्वात् त्रिशकारः स्यादिति दोषः). (This argument is apparently based on the understanding that P. 8. 4. 65 is obligatory). Hence the need of this *Vār*. which seeks to prohibit the application of P. 1. 1. 10 in the *śś* environment.

Kaiy. and Nāg. have minor differences with Bhar. as to the authority according to which this compound is formed. Kaiy. invokes *bahulam* occurring in P. 2. 1. 32 : कर्तृकरणे कृता बहुलम् while Nāg. prefers मयूरव्यंसकादित्वात् or still better सुप्सुपेति. (*Chāyā* explains : बाहुलकस्य सर्वथागतिकत्वादाह — मयूरेति । असमानाधिकरणे तदप्रवृत्तेराह — सुप्सुपेति ।) — In *l*. 9, त्रिशकारः=त्रिशकार एव.

[1. 3]

(*p*. 36, *l*. 11) अत्र चोदयन्ति. The *Dīp*. here introduces a fresh objection against the *Vār*. It is argued here that if *savarṇagrahaṇa* is effective here, the reduplication will not take place at all and there will be consequently no need to invoke P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे.

The objector points out that the *ac* status bestowed on *ś* by *savarṇagrahaṇa* is not an unmixed evil. It has a good side too. It will prevent P. 8. 4. 47 from applying to *paraśśata* since not being followed by *ac* is the specific condition for reduplication laid down in the Sū. (8. 4. 47). Since there are no longer three *ś*-s, but only two, deleting of one *ś* is no longer necessary. And, further, since it is no longer necessary to invoke P. 8. 4. 65, it does not matter if there is no *sāvarṇya* between the two *ś*-s. Let P. 1. 1. 10 apply. The *Vār*. is superfluous.

The *Dīp*. न एवं परिहारमाहुः (*l*. 14) ... etc. represents refutation of this argument. The refutation consists in taking *anaci* in P. 8. 4. 47 as a *paryudāsa*. अनचि=अचोऽन्यस्मिन् or अज्भिन्ने (परतः सति). And here, says the advocate of the *Vār*., that *ś* is अचोऽन्यः. After all *ś* is a consonant. That is its basic character. Its *ac* status is only secondary. Since *ś* is 'other than *ac*', P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च must apply, resulting into reduplication, i. e. giving, in all, three *ś*-s. P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि has to be invoked. (So the *Vār*. which pleads for suspending the

operation of P. 1. 1. 10 with a view to preserving the homogeneity of two *ś*-s is necessary.)

(*p*. 36, *l*. 16) एतदसत्। न ह्येतत् संज्ञासु ... etc. This *Dīp.* rejects the *parihāra* given above. The main point of this refutation is that as far as a name is concerned, *ś* is not अचोऽन्यः. It is *ac*. (And so you cannot justify the *Vār.*)

The *Dīp.* argues that *ś* has a double status. It is *hal* (i. e. is known by the name *hal*), because it is included in the Akṣaras. between *h* ... *l*. It has also got the name *ac* on account of *savarṇagrahaṇa* (इह शकारो हल् चाच् च). It does not cease to be *ac* simply because it has another name *hal*. The name *ac* denotes what is purely and exclusively *ac* but in addition it can also denote a sort of secondary *ac*, i. e. a phoneme which has both an *ac* status and also a *hal* status. Therefore the rule अनचि च, looking upon *ś* as not different from an *ac* will not apply to *paraśśata*. There is no justification for the *Vār.*

This view is supported by two parallel cases, one from the *loka*, and the other from the Veda. The *laukika* parallel involves the *prāsādavāsinyāya* (with which we have already met under the Sū. मुखनासिका°, P. 1. 1. 8). According to that maxim, the name प्रासादवासिन् means not only one who dwells on the upper floors, but also one who lives on both the upper and the ground floors. That is why when it is said : अप्रासादवासिन आनीयन्ताम्, the one who lives on both the floors is also excluded as he is not an अप्रासादवासिन्; he is still a प्रासादवासिन्.

Similarly if a goat is black-white (शबलः, partly black, partly white), it cannot be offered in a sacrifice if the specific injunction is ' one should sacrifice a non-black goat ' (अकृष्णमालभेत; nor even in the opposite case : अशुक्लमालभेत). Although the goat has some white patches, he does not cease to be black (and also vice versa). Since he is still black, he is not non-black (*akṛṣṇaḥ*) and so is not excluded from black. The same applies to *anaci*. The phoneme *ś* is still *ac*. ' Once an *ac*, always an *ac*. '

In *l*. 17, शकारो वर्ज्येत=अनच् इति स्वीक्रियेत, अज्भिन्नत्वेन अङ्गीक्रियेत.

In *l*. 18 the clause एकार्थचोदना ... पद्यते is not clear. Probably the MS is here partly corrupt.

In *ll*. 19–20, भवितव्यमानयनेन ... न भवितव्यम् is a rhetoric question. न भवितव्यमानयनेन is the implied reply.

In *l*. 21, [अ]शुक्लम् is our emendation. An explanation is necessary. The MS actually reads : किमकृष्णमालभेत शुक्लमाल°. Although the eds. have read the first part as किं कृष्णम्, the MS, as reproduced above, reads किमकृष्णम् (i. e. किम् अकृष्णम्), which we have followed. And there seems no doubt that that is the

genuine text. For, the object of our discussion is the word *anac* which is a *nañ*-Tatpurṣa and the exclusion (*paryudāsa*) is the point of discussion. The *laukika* parallel is *aprāsādavāsin*, again a *nañ*-Tatpuruṣa, and therefore a fitting parallel for that reason. In the Vedic parallel also, therefore the example has to be a *nañ*-Tatpuruṣa, which is actually so in the MS. Hence our retention of it. On the other hand शुक्लम् (also retained in the eds.) must obviously be a scribal error, and so has to be emended to [अ]शुक्लम् for logical consistency. It must be made clear that we have not actually come across such injunctions. Those which have actually occurred are, to quote a few : 'वायव्यं श्वेतमालभेत भूतिकामः' (*TaittSaṁh.* 2. 1. 1. 1)। 'सौम्यं बभ्रुं लोमशं पिङ्गलमालभेत पशुकामः' ((*MaitrSaṁh.* 2. 5. 1)। 'श्वेतं वायवे नियुत्वता आलभेत' (*ibid.*)। 'वारुणं कृष्णं पेत्वमालभेताभिचरन्' (2. 5. 6)। 'रोहिणीं बार्हस्पत्यामालभेत ब्रह्मवर्चसकामः' (2. 5. 7)। 'भौमीं कृष्णशबलीमालभेतान्नकामः' (2. 5. 7).

The two mentioned in the *Dīp*., containing the two *nañ*-Tatpuruṣa compounds *akṛṣṇa* and *aśukla*, may be perhaps hypothetical cases.

(*p*. 36, *l*. 23) एवं तु त्रिशकारत्वमिह ... etc. This *Dīp*. sums up the argument in favour of the *pūrvapakṣa Vār*. Contrary to what is said just above, it is now maintained (for a different reason) that *ś* does not have *ac* status in the matter of reduplication (कुतोऽस्य द्विर्वचनविधावच्त्वम् ?). Therefore अनचि च applies and the form with three *ś*-s results quite logically (त्रिशकारत्वमिह न्यायप्राप्तमेव). The reason given is that although there is no prohibition of homogeneity between *ac* and *hal* within P. 1. 1. 10 (and so *ś* gets *ac* status), elsewhere the prohibition does exist (and so there is no *ac*-status for *ś* in *paraśśata*), this finally leading, as said above, to the presence of three *ś*-s.

Observation : With this argument, one rather expected the initial words to be एवमपि 'even so', not एवं तु 'but, in this way'. What is meant is that the argument about *ś* continuing to be called *ac* (on the parallel of प्रासादवासिन्याय etc.) would be all right if there was no prohibition of homogeneity when an abbreviation like *ac* was used elsewhere. But it is. The three *ś*-s do result. झरो झरि ... (P. 8. 4. 65) has to be resorted to. So the *sāvarṇya* has to be preserved between the two *ś* s. That is why the *Vār*. says that *śś* has to be somehow exempted from the operation of P. 1. 1. 10.

(*p*. 36, *l*. 25) तस्मादस्य ... etc. The *Dīp*. here suggests that the mischief has to be nipped in the bud. A way has to be found out so that in this Sū. *i*, included in the abbreviation *ac*, does not comprehend *ś*. For, once such a comprehension is there (in this Sū.), it is obvious that it will be there elsewhere also —इह प्रत्याहारे=" नाज्झलौ " इति सूत्रे 'अच्' इति प्रत्याहारे. ग्रहणे=शकारस्य इकारेण ग्रहणे सति.

In एतच्च प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधो ... etc. The *Dīp.* draws our attention to the background of the *Vār.* which has not been mentioned so far. We are told that नाज्झलौ is a प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध. If it had been पर्युदास (यदि हि पर्युदासः स्यात्) there would have been no problem. In a single rule the name *savarṇa* would be taught, with the exception that there is no homogeneity between *ac* and *hal* phonemes. (तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वे सति अज्झलौ मिथो वर्जयित्वा वर्णाः सवर्णसंज्ञाः स्युः or some such thing. Or, to stick to Pāṇini's words : *तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नमनज्झल् सवर्णम्.) This would have meant अचामज्भिः सावर्ण्यम्, हलां च हल्भिः. No problem in *śś* case. However the negation has been made in the प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध way. The mutual homogeneity of *ac* and *hal* has been included in the general rule P. 1. 1. 9. But as it is not desired, it is prohibited in the present rule. The *Vār.* had to make this suggestion because नाज्झलौ is a प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध. (At least Kāt. takes it as such.) If it had been a पर्युदास (or if Kāt. had taken it such), there would not have been a need for this *Vār.* That is why the *Dīp.* says that Kāt. in this *Vār.* uses the word प्रतिषेध in the sense of प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध (प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधं प्रतिषेध इत्याह). — In *l.* 27 ***vākyam*** of course means *vārttikam.*

Readings : (1) (*p.* 34, *l.* 18) MS [ऽ]नच्त्वात् (for ऽज्झल्त्वात्). — (2) (*p.* 34, *l.* 18) MS अज्झलावच्त्वात् ।। च्चातक्यौ ; AL अज्झलौ अच्त्वात् शक्यौ; Sw च्चातव्यो (for अच्त्वात् [हल्त्वा]च्चाशक्यौ). — (3) (*p.* 34, *l.* 21) Sw °संज्ञा- (for °संज्ञातो). — (4) (*p.* 34, *l.* 21) AL इत्येतदध्यवसीयते (for इति च द्वेधा वर्ण्यते).—(5) (*p.* 34, *l.* 22) MS ALSw ऊकालो (for -झलोः). — Sw om प्रतिषेधः — (6) (*p.* 34, *l.* 23) MS सकारप्रति ; AL शकारं प्रति. Sw reads यद्य as षेधः and supplies (यद्य). — (7) (*p.* 35, *l.* 1) MSSw सवर्ण (MS °र्णं) गृहीत्य ; AL °र्णं गृहीत्वा. — (8) (*p.* 35, *l.* 1) MSSw यथास्त्रणा ; AL यथाशास्त्रेण (for यद्वा शा°). — (9) (*p.* 35, *l.* 6) MS °सवर्ण... मामथ. — (10) (*p.* 35, *l.* 9) MS ग्रहणात् ग्रहणे ग्रहणाभाव ग्रहणके ; AL °णात् ग्रहणं ग्रहणाभावे ग्रहणकशा° ; Sw °णाण्ग्रहणे ग्रहणाभावः. — (11) (*p.* 35, *l.* 11) AL om. तत्र ह्यज्ग्रहणे ग्रहणकशास्त्रमनभिनिर्वृत्तं क्रियमाणत्वात् संज्ञासंज्ञिसंबन्धस्य । — (12) (*p.* 35, *l.* 13) MS निरूप्यते (for विरुध्यते).—(13) (*p.* 35, *l.* 13) AL सति आह 'हलन्त्यम्' इत्यत्र लकार°. – (14) (*p.* 35, *l.* 14) MS °बंधत्वात् रापितत्वात् ; *Mbh.* ed. °धाज्ञापि°. —(15) (*p.* 35, *l.* 19) MSALSw चाण्ग्रहणे.—(16) (*p.* 35, *l.* 20) MS °शास्त्रस्यैवाभावात् ; AL °शास्त्रस्यावकाशाभावात् (for our emendation °शास्त्रान्तरस्याभावात्). — (17) (*p.* 35, *l.* 21) MS °निवृत्तर्त्यं ; AL °निर्वर्त्यं ; Sw °निर्वृत्त(ः) स. — (18) (*p.* 35, *l.* 22) AL om च. — (19) (*p.* 35, *l.* 23) AL नास्त्येव (for नानेनास्यैव). — (19A) (*p.* 35, *l.* 23) AL शक्यं. — (20) (*p.* 35, *l.* 25) For our emendation न (for च), see *Notes.* — (21) (*p.* 35, *l.* 26) For our emendation सवर्णसंज्ञाप्रतिषेधः, see *Notes.* — (22) (*p.* 35, *l.* 27) MSALSw चा(AL °वा)पवादं (for वापवादविषयम् in the *Mbh.*). — (23) (*p.* 35, *l.* 1) AL drop न. — (24) (*p.* 36, *l.* 3) MSAL दोषमाह इति (for दोषः इति). — (25) (*p.* 36, *l.* 8) MS समासार्थौ वा ; AL Sw °सोऽथवा (for सः । परार्थौ). — (26) (*p.* 36, *l.* 11) MSAL read शकारश्चेदजिति twice. — (27) (*p.* 36, *l.* 12) MSAL प्रतिषेधे. — (28) (*p.* 36, *l.* 13) MSSw

चायतेन (for चात्र तेन). — (29) (*p*. 36, *l*. 15) AL drop the first ऽयम्. — (30) (*p*. 36, *l*. 16) MS AL यत् (MS य) तद् (for एतद्). — (31) (*p*. 36, *l*. 16) MSSw हकारो (for श°). — (32) (*p*. 36, *l*. 16) MS हलाचात् च; Sw हल्त्वात् च (for हल् चाच). — (33) (*p*. 36, *l*. 17) MSSw हकारो (for श°). — (34) (*p*. 36, *l*. 17) MSAL वक्ष्येत (for the first वर्ज्येत). — The MS reads न वक्ष्येत twice with वक्ष्येत for the first time. Sw drops न वर्ज्येत. — (35) (*p*. 36, *l*. 18) MSSw वर्ज्येतोकार्थ°. — (35A) (*p*. 36, *l*. 18) MS षतियष्यं ते; AL प्रतिषिध्यते; Sw °पद्यन्ते. —(36) (*p*. 36, *l*. 19) MS किमु ...; Sw किमु (भूमि-) (for किमुभय°). — (37) (*p*. 36, *l*. 20) ALSw drop प्रासादवासित्वादशक्योऽसौ. — (38) (*p*. 36, *l*. 20) MSSw °देष्टव्येति; AL °देष्टव्य इति. — (39) (*p*. 36, *l*. 21) ALSw कृष्णम् (for अकृष्णम्). — (40) (*p*. 36, *l*. 21) MSALSw शुक्लम्. See *Notes*. — (41) (*p*. 36, *l*. 23) MS °षोधनयमिति; Sw °षेधो, न (पर्युदासोऽ)य°.

[2]

सिद्धमनच्त्वात् (*Vār*. 3) is the first Siddhānta-Vārttika, which rejects the suggestion made in *Vār*. 1. The argument is that since there is no *ac*-status for *ś*, there is no possibility of P. 1. 1. 10 applying to *śś* and consequently there is no possibility of the loss of *sāvarṇya*. So a separate provision, exempting *śś* from the application of P. 1. 1. 10 is not necessary.

(*p*. 37, *l*. 3) आस्यान्तर्वर्तिनः प्रयत्नस्यः ... etc. This gives the reason behind denying the name *ac*- to *ś*. The *sāvarṇya* is decided, not only on the basis of place of articulation, but of internal effort also. And the internal efforts of *i* and *ś* differ. That of *i*, as of any vowel, is *vivṛta* while that of *ś*, as of any *ūṣman*, is *īṣad-vivṛta*. Since the efforts differ, you cannot look on *ś* as *i*; *ś* has no *ac*-status. Cf. the *Mbh*. (not quoted in the *Dīp*.) : सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् ? अनच्त्वात् । कथमनच्त्वम् ? 'स्पृष्टं स्पर्शानां करणम्। ईषत् स्पृष्टमन्तस्थानाम् । विवृतमूष्मणाम्' । 'ईषद्' इत्यनुवर्तते । 'स्वराणां च' । विवृतम् । 'ईषद्' इति निवृत्तम् ।

The *Dīp*. सूत्रप्रत्याख्यानेन परिहार उक्तः means that the solution consists in rejecting the prohibitory rule नाज्झलौ itself, as it is redundant. Kaiy. practically means the same thing when he says : सूत्रप्रत्याख्यानसाधारणमुक्तम्. — For the reading of this part of the MS by AL and Sw, see *Readings* below.

(*p*. 37, *l*. 4) यथा तु पाणिनीयैः पठितम् ... etc. The *Dīp*. is here preparing the ground for the next *Vār*. which gives an alternative solution. Bhar. suggests that Kāt. is himself not quite satisfied with the *anactva* reason. The reason advanced for this dissatisfaction is that according to the Pāṇinīyas *īṣat* is either present in both the rules (i. e. ईषद्विवृतमूष्मणाम् । ईषद्विवृतं स्वराणां च ।) or absent from both (i. e. विवृतमूष्मणाम् । स्वराणां च ।). In either case the *sāvarṇya* is bound to be there, which will then lead to the *ac* status of *ś*. So, says Bhar., Kāt. gives another reason (तथा परिहारम् [= परिहारान्तरम्] आह).

Observation : It is not known from which text Pat. quotes the passage स्पृष्टं स्पर्शानां करणम् etc. Dādhimatha, the editor of the Nirṇayasāgara ed., observes : स्पृष्टमित्यादीनि चत्वारि शौनकप्रातिशाख्यसूत्राणि बोध्यानि. But this does not seem to be correct. The text quoted by Pat. is in prose while the Śau. Prātiśākhya is in verse. All that this work has to say on the matter in question is :

> तद्विशेषः करणं स्पृष्टमस्थितं
> दुस्पृष्टं तु प्राग्घकाराच्चतुर्णाम् ।
> स्वरानुस्वारोष्मणामस्पृष्टं स्थितं
> नैके कण्ठ्यस्य स्थितमाहुरूष्मणः ॥ (XIII Sū. 8–11=Stanza 3)

From Bhartṛhari's words 'यथा तु पाणिनीयैः पठितम् ... ' etc. it appears that Bhar. looks upon the text as belonging to the Pāṇinian system itself, unless one understands पठ् (in पठितम्) as meaning 'to interpret'.

[2. 1]

वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेर्वा (*Vār.* 3). The *Mbh.* explains the *Vār.* thus : वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेर्वा सिद्धमेतत् । किमिदं वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेरिति ? वर्णानामुपदेशस्तावत् । उपदेशोत्तरकालेत्संज्ञा । इत्संज्ञोत्तरकाल 'आदिरन्त्येन सहेता' इति प्रत्याहारः । प्रत्याहारोत्तरकाला सवर्णसंज्ञा । सवर्णसंज्ञोत्तरकालम् 'अणुदित्-सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः' इति सवर्णग्रहणम् । एतेन सर्वेण समुदितेन वाक्येनान्यत्र सवर्णानां ग्रहणं भवति । न चात्रेकारः शकारं गृह्णाति ।

This *Vār.* advances an alternative reason. It maintains that P. 1. 1. 69 has no occasion to operate here and so there is no possibility of *ś* being comprehended by *i* and, consequently, it cannot have an *ac*-status. So, *śś* can continue to have homogeneousness.

The argument is like this : P. 1. 1. 69 requires two accessories to be completed before it can function. The two accessories are the abbreviated name *aṇ* and *savarṇa*. Unless and until these two factors are fully understood, the rule cannot function. And as it happens the factor of homogeneousness is not yet fully known. It is in the process of being taught. Only after it is known fully in the form of *utsarga* and *apavāda* P. 1. 1. 69 is able to operate. So, the two consecutive *śś* sounds remain unaffected. The suggestion in the *Vār.* 1 is superfluous.

(*p.* 37, *l.* 7) By *vākya* in the *Vār.* वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेर्वा P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित्सवर्णस्य is meant. '*ś* is not comprehended by *i* (नास्ति ग्रहणम्) and so *sāvarṇya* in *śś* is intact' — that is the predicate to be completed. The *Dīp.* adds that the reason behind saying that P. 1. 1. 69 is as yet अपरिसमाप्त is that it is अपरिसमाप्तार्थ. A sentence-meaning becomes complete only after the co-ordination of the *pada*- meanings. Until the *pada*- meanings are known and co-ordinated, no sentence can convey its meaning. In the present case the full mean-

ing of the *pada* '*savarṇa*' is yet to be known. So, when P. 1. 1. 10 : नाज्झलौ is conveying its meaning, P. 1. 1. 69 : अणुदित् ... cannot act on it. The *Dīp.* goes further and says that even in the very Sū. P. 1. 1. 69 अण् does not have the power of सवर्णग्रहण (ग्रहणम् = सवर्णग्रहणम्), because the sentence (P. 1. 1. 69) is still अपरिसमाप्तार्थ ; what to say then about its inability to function in the preceding stages from उपदेश up to the सवर्णसंज्ञा ?

In *l.* 9 the *Dīp.* reads अङ्गयोरनिर्ज्ञानात्. Here अङ्गयो: seems to be a loose writing for अङ्गस्य. Only one *aṅga*, viz. सवर्णसंज्ञा remains to be known. The other *aṅga*, viz. the name *aṇ*, is known already. Note the words सवर्णसंज्ञाया अस्मिन् सूत्रेऽनिष्पादात् from the following Kaiy. : भवतु वा तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नत्वं, तथापीहेकारेण शकारो न गृह्यते, सवर्णसंज्ञाया अस्मिन्सूत्रेऽनिष्पादात्। अस्मिन् हि सूत्रे निष्पन्ने सत्यपवादविषयपरिहारेणेष्टविषये सवर्णसंज्ञा प्रवर्तते। न त्वेतत्सूत्रनिष्पत्त्यवस्थायाम्। ततश्चाङ्गेषूपदेशेत्संज्ञाप्रत्याहारसवर्णत्वेषु निष्पन्नेषु 'अणुदित्सवर्णस्य' इत्येतत् 'अस्य च्वौ' इत्यादिषु प्रवर्तते, न त्वङ्गेषूपदेशादिषु, नापि स्वात्मनि। ततश्चात्र सूत्रेऽङ्गानिष्पत्त्या 'अणुदित्-' इत्यस्याप्रवर्तनादिकारेण शकारस्याग्रहणात्सवर्णत्वं शकारयो: सिद्धम्।

(*p.* 37, *l.* 14) नात्र पाठक्रमोऽभिप्रेत: ... etc. The *Mbh.* statement प्रत्याहारोत्तरकाला च सवर्णसंज्ञा contradicts the actual sequence of rules involved. Rules teaching *savarṇa* come first (P. 1. 1. 9–10) while the one teaching the *pratyāhāra* names comes much later (P. 1. 1. 71). So the *Dīp.* clarifies that the *Mbh.* is not referring to the sequence of rules in which they are read in the *Aṣṭ.* but to the natural or logical sequence in which they present themselves in the present context.

अन्यत्राप्यच्त्वव्यपदेशेषु (*l.* 18) = 'अस्य च्वौ' (P. 7. 4. 32) इत्येवमादिषु.

नैवात्र ग्रहणं न प्रतिषेध: (*l.* 18). P. 1. 1. 69 is neutral with reference to P. 1. 1. 10. There is no *savarṇagrahaṇa* here (say of *ī*/*ś* by *i*), and, consequently no prohibition of *sāvarṇya* between them.

An interesting implication of the above statement is discussed in the following lines in the *Dīp.* (*ll.* 20, 21) with special reference to the case of कुमारी शेते. The two phonemes *ī* and *ś* have both a common place of articulation and also a common mode of articulation (*prayatna*). So as far as P. 1. 1. 9 : तुल्यास्यप्रयत्नं सवर्णम् is concerned the two are named 'homogeneous'. Now, although P. 1. 1. 10 : नाज्झलौ prohibits *sāvarṇya* between *ac* and *hal*, by *ac* are meant, as we have seen, only *a*, *i*, *u*, etc. and not *ā*, *ī*, *ū* etc. also (since P. 1. 1. 69 is inactive here). So the result is that the *sāvarṇya* established by P. 1. 1. 9 between *ī* and *ś* remains intact (ईकारशकारयो: न प्रतिषिद्धा सवर्णसंज्ञा). But this is likely to have an undesired effect in connection with P. 6. 1. 101 : अक: सवर्णे दीर्घ:. As a result of this rule a single long substitute threatens to take the place of -*ī ś*-. To obviate it, *aci* (in P. 6. 1. 77) is made to continue in P. 6. 1.

101. The result is that P. 6. 1. 101 applies in cases like कुमारी इच्छति etc., but not in कुमारी शेते. — अजधिकारात् = 'अचि' इत्यस्यानुवृत्तेः।

The upshot of the whole discussion is that the *savarṇagrahaṇa* taught by P. 1. 1. 69 does not apply to *ac* in P. 1. 1. 10. The practice of the Pāṇinīyas to bring down *aci* in P. 6. 1. 101 is a clue (ज्ञापक) to the inference : नैवात्र ग्रहणं न प्रतिषेधः.

यथैव तर्हि इकारः शकारं (*l.* 22) ... etc. The remaining part of this *Mbh.* which completes the argument is thus : तत्र को दोषः? कुमारी ईहते कुमारीहते — 'अकः सवर्णे ...' दीर्घत्वं न प्राप्नोति। This is the point : If there is to be no comprehension of *ī* by a short *i*, then *ī* will have neither an *ak*-status nor an *ac*-status as a result of which there will be no single long substitute for the two *ī*-s. The desired form कुमारीहते cannot be had.

(*p.* 37, *l.* 23) एवं मन्यते ... etc. This *Dīp.* explains the misunderstanding behind the objection and clarifies the correct position. The objector sees that there is no comprehension of *ī* here in P. 1. 1. 10 and he jumps to the conclusion that *ī* will be nowhere comprehended by *i*. But he is not correct. There is a difference of relationship between P. 1. 1. 69 and P. 1. 1. 10 on the one hand and the one between P. 1. 1. 69 and P. 6. 1. 101 on the other. P. 1. 1. 10 is meant for, and is subordinate to, P. 1. 1. 69. Until P. 1. 1. 10 is established, P. 1. 1. 69 is incomplete (अपरिसमाप्त). So it cannot act on P. 1. 1. 10. But that is not the case with P. 6. 1. 101. It is not meant for, and is not subordinate to, P. 1. 1. 69. On the contrary P. 1. 1. 69 is for P. 6. 1. 101. And, as P. 1. 1. 69 is now already complete itself, there is no reason why it should not apply where P. 6. 1. 101 is concerned.

The *Chāyā* puts the objection in the form of a logical syllogism thus : विमत इकारः सवर्णग्राहकः। इकारत्वात्। एतत्सूत्र(P. 1. 1. 10)गताच्गतेकारवत्। It points out the fallacy in this syllogism thus : स्वस्वाङ्गान्यतरगतत्वोपाधिपराहतमनुमानम्.

चक्रकम् (*l.* 23), the cycle, i. e. the cycle of arguments. This refers to the *Mbh.* वर्णानामुपदेशस्तावत् ... ग्रहणं भवति quoted above.

वर्णानामुपदेशादिष्वेव ... etc. (*l.* 24). Here the reply commences. So a word like *tu* (which indicates *pakṣavyāvṛtti*) was necessary. By *ādi* (in *upadeśādiṣu*) are meant the name *it*, the abbreviated names (*pratyāhāra*), and the name *savarṇa*.

यथा कपालावस्थायां ... etc. (*l.* 24). P. 1. 1. 69 is like a *jar* which can function only after its potsherds — *upadeśa*, *it*, *pratyāhāra* and *savarṇa* — are put together. Before this, it simply does not exist.

अनेनोपायेन (*l.* 27), by this objection and reply to it.

In *l.* 27. इह विषये='अकः सवर्णे दीर्घः' इत्यादिषु· इह='नाज्झलौ' इत्यादिषु (उपदेशादिषु in general).

[2. 3]

अपर आह etc. Here the *Mbh.* quotes another interpretation of the *Vār*.-s सिद्धमनच्त्वात् and वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेः. According to this unnamed scholar (referred to simply by *aparaḥ*), वाक्यापरिसमाप्तेः is not another reason for *iṣṭasiddhi*, but a reason for *anactva* (the first reason for *iṣṭasiddhi*) itself. The *anactva* of *ś*, in its turn, is now accounted for, not on the basis of difference in *prayatna* but on the basis of the inability of P. 1. 1. 69 to extend *ac*-status to *ś* on account of वाक्यापरिसमाप्ति. So the *Dīp.* says: सिद्धेरनच्त्वं हेतुः, अनच्त्वस्य वाक्यापरिसमाप्तिः।

(*p.* 38, *l.* 2) अत्र तु साध्यस्य भिन्नत्वात् ... etc. This *Dīp.* introduces the *Mbh.* अस्मिन् पक्षे वा etc. The *Mbh.* here points out that *vā* 'or' in *Vār.* 4 loses its *raison d'tre* on this alternative interpretation. Previously two different reasons were assigned for the achievement of a common goal and so *vā* was all right there. But now the two reasons are meant for two different goals and so *vā* is unjustified (अत्र तु साध्यस्य भिन्नत्वात् हेतुविकल्पो न युज्यते ... असमर्थितं भवति।)

(*p.* 38, *l.* 4) एतच्च समर्थितम्. This is followed in the *Mbh.* by अस्तु वा शकारस्य शकारेण सवर्णसंज्ञा, मा वा भूत्। ननु चोक्तम् — परश्शतानि कार्याणि, 'झरो झरि सवर्णे' इति लोपो न प्राप्नोति। मा भूल्लोपः।

The *Dīp.* says that *vā* is used for indicating an alternative enunciation (*pratijñā*). The first *pratijñā* is that because of *anactva* i. e. absence of *ac*-status for *ś* (based on वाक्यापरिसमाप्ति) *sāvarṇya* in *śś* remains intact (अस्तु वा शकारस्य शकारेण सावर्ण्यसंज्ञा as the *Mbh.* says). The second *pratijñā* (indicated by *vā*) is: मा वा भूत्. Alternatively — it says — it does not matter even if there is no *sāvarṇya* in *śś* (because of comprehension of *ś* by *i*: यदि वा ग्रहणमिकारेण शकारस्य as the *Dīp.* says).

So *vā* is justified because of the alternative it indicates.

(*p.* 38, *l.* 6) ननु च भेदो भवति. Before this *Mbh.* there is the following passage which the *Dīp.* has skipped over: ननु चोक्तं परश्शतानि कार्याणि etc. (*p.* 36, *l.* 5).

The opponent is surprised at what he sees as the cavalier attitude reflected in the *Mbh.* मा वा भूत्. Has he not already said that if there is no *sāvarṇya* in *śś* then a *ś* cannot be deleted by P. 8. 4. 65: झरो झरि सवर्णे in the word परश्शत?

मा भूल्लोपः 'well! if the deletion is not possible, let there be no deletion. It does not matter' is the quiet reply of the defendant at which the

objector explains his objection thus : ननु च भेदो भवति। सति लोपे द्विशकारकम्, असति लोपे त्रिशकारकम्. The *Dīp.* further points out that it will not do to say that is makes no difference if there are two *ś*-s or three *ś*-s on the ground that there is no auditory difference. For, it does make a difference (अभ्युपगम्य श्रुतिकृतं भेदमिदमुच्यते) auditorially.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 8) विभाषा द्विर्वचनम्. This *pratīka* represents the following *Mbh.* : नास्ति भेदः। असत्यपि लोपे द्विशकारकमेव। कथम्? विभाषा द्विर्वचनम्।

This is what the defendant means to say : Well! what exactly is your difficulty? Do you mean to say that if there is no deletion of *ś* then the form with two *ś*-s cannot be had[1]? You are mistaken. The original reduplication by P. 8. 4. 47 : अनचि च is itself optional (since, as the *Dīp.* points out, *vā* is continued there from P. 8. 4. 45). If, taking advantage of this option, we do not reduplicate *ś*, then the form with two *ś*-s is already achieved. For, with only two *ś*-s there now there is no occasion for P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि सवर्णे (which requires *hal* + *jhar* + (*savarṇa*) *jhar*) to operate. Cf. Nāg. : भाष्ये 'असति लोपे त्रिशकारमि'ति वदन् प्रष्टव्यः — किं द्विशकारं न स्यादिति तवाशयः, उत त्रिशकारं स्यादिति।

स एष कथं भेदो न स्यात्? (*l*. 9). This *pratīka* stands for the following *Mbh.* : एवमपि भेदः। असति लोपे कदाचिद् द्विशकारकम्, कदाचित् त्रिशकारकम्। सति लोपे द्विशकारकमेव। स एष कथं भेदो न स्यात्?

The objector says that even if reduplication be optional still (एवमपि) the optionality or otherwise of the elsion is going to make the difference. If reduplication is not carried out then then there is no problem. But if it is carried out, then the deletion will result into a two-*ś* form while the absence of deletion will result into a three *ś* form. The problem is not that we do not get a two *ś* form. Rather it is that a three-*ś* form results (undesiredly?). So there *is* a difference (अस्त्येव भेदः).

यदि नित्यो लोपः ... विभाषा स लोपः. The defendant says that the difference spoken of by the objector would he there (स्याद् भेदः) if the elision had been obligatory (यदि नित्यो लोपः स्यात्); but, as it happens, that elision is optional (विभाषा स लोपः), since, as the *Dīp.* points out, *anyatarasyām* is continued in P. 8. 4. 65 : झरो झरि ... from P. 8. 4. 62 : झयो हो ....

(*p*. 38, *l*. 12) एवं चेत् यथाभेद आवयोः ... etc. It is concluded that since the elision is optional, it does not matter whether there is *sāvarṇya* in *śś* (and consequently elision of *ś*) or whether there is no *sāvarṇya* (and consequently no

1. The remainder of this query is : 'Or do you mean to say that a three-*ś* form results undesiredly?' (It is hinted later on that the three-*ś* form is not undesired.

elision). Whatever view you may adopt about the *sāvarṇya*, you get both the two-*ś* form and also the three-*ś* form. There is no disparity. Both get what they want. Grammar is favourable to both (... यथाभेद् आवयोस्तथा शास्त्रमवस्थितम्). This is obviously so because both the reduplication and the elision are optional and so equally exercise a sort of check and balance on each other.

This can be shown in the tabular form as below :

I. वैकल्पिके लोपे

सावर्ण्ये	रूपाणि	सावर्ण्याभावे (अतश्च लोपाभावे)	रूपाणि
1. द्वित्वे, लोपे च	2	1. द्वित्वे	3
2. द्वित्वे लोपाभावे	3	2. द्वित्वाभावे	2
3. द्वित्वाभावे (अतः लोपाभावे च)	2		

II. नित्ये लोपे

सावर्ण्ये	रूपाणि	सावर्ण्याभावे (अतश्च लोपाभावे)	रूपाणि
1. द्वित्वे लोपे च	2	द्वित्वे	3
2. द्वित्वाभावे (अतश्च लोपाभावे)	2	द्वित्वाभावे	2

Observation : So, on the view that elision is optional, the three-*ś* form is unavoidable, whether *sāvarṇya* in *śś* is accepted or not. So, after all, it seems that the three-*ś* form has to be accepted. Cf. Nāg : त्रिशकारमिष्टमेवेति तात्पर्यम्.

(*p*. 38, *l*. 12) अपरेषां व्याख्यानम् ... etc. This refers to only a minor difference in the interpretation of the *Mbh*. It does not make any difference of meaning. In the interpretation given above स एष कथं भेदो न स्यात् was looked upon as one sentence. In the interpretation of some ' others ' (अपरेषाम्) स्यात् is separated and it is tagged on to the following sentence (i. e. स्यात्, यदि नित्यो ... etc.).

Incidentally, Kaiy. gives only this construction.

Readings : (1) (*p*. 37, *l*. 4) MS सत्रप्रत्याख्यातेन; AL तत्र प्रत्याख्यानेन; Sw सूत्रं प्रत्याख्या(य)ते । न. — (2) (*p*. 37, *l*. 5) MS पाणिनीया; Sw निना. — (3) (*p*. 37, *l*. 9) MSSw बा(MS वा)ह्यस्य (for वाक्यस्य). — (4) (*p*. 37, *l*. 10) MS पदानिज्ञते; Sw यदानिर्ज्ञाते. — (5) (*p*. 37, *l*. 11) MS Sw तदाग्रहणम्. — (6) (*p*. 37, *l*. 12) ALSw उच्चारितम्. — (7) (*p*. 37, *l*. 12) After उच्चरितम्, MS inserts श्रयो; AL यथा; Sw श्रचो. — (8) (*p*. 37, *l*. 13) Neither the MS nor

the eds. read न. — (9) (*p.* 37, *l.* 13) Sw यत्रैदुपायानि. — (10) (*p.* 37, *l.* 14) MS नापाठः; Sw न पाठ- (for नात्र पाठ- as in AL). — (11) (*p.* 37, *l.* 16) MS AL Sw अनिवृत्तं. — (12) (*p.* 37, *l.* 17) After भवति, तदा AL insert भावि. — (13) (*p.* 37, *l.* 19) MS इकार- (for ईकार). — (14) (*p.* 37, *l.* 19) Neither the MS nor the eds. read न here. — (15) (*p.* 37, *l.* 22) AL यद्येवं (for यथैव). — (16) (*p.* 37, *l.* 24) MSSw -देशादित्ये (MS °ष्ये) व. — (17) (*p.* 37, *l.* 24) AL om. हि. — (18) (*p.* 37, *l.* 25) MS -विशेः, AL Sw -विरो(धः) (for -विशेषः). — (19) (*p.* 37, *l.* 27) After भविष्यति, AL insert (इति). — (20) (*p.* 38, *l.* 1) MS एतावानस्तु; Sw °नस्ति. — (21) (*p.* 38, *l.* 1) MS सिद्धेरनज्ञत्वं हेतुर्; AL सिद्धमनच्त्वम्। हेतुर्. — (22) (*p.* 38, *l.* 2) MS हेतुर्विकल्पेन यु°. — (23) (*p.* 38, *l.* 6) AL om. वा; also चाग्र° (for वा ग्र°) and ईकारेण (for इका°). — (24) (*p.* 38, *l.* 11) *Mbh.* ed. विभाषा तु स लोपः. — (25) (*p.* 38, *l.* 12) AL °भेदः. AL अनयोस् (for आव°). — (26) (*p.* 38, *l.* 14) Sw स्यादेष. —AL भेद इति.—The MS repeats the last sentence thus: स्यादेष भेदो यदि नित्योः स्यादिति, while AL repeat स्यादेव भेद इति.

ABBREVIATIONS

AL	=	Abhyankar and Limaye
Bhar.	=	Bhartṛhari
Dīp.	=	*Dīpikā*
Kaiy.	=	Kaiyaṭa
Kāś.	=	*Kāśikā*
Kāt.	=	Kātyāyana
Mbh.	=	*Mahābhāṣya*
MS.	=	Manuscript
Nāg.	=	Nāgeśa, Nāgojibhaṭṭa
NS	=	*Nyāya-Sūtra*
om.	=	omit(s)
P.	=	Pāṇini
Padam.	=	*Padamañjarī*
P. Dh.	=	Pāṇinīya Dhātupāṭha
Pari.	=	Paribhāṣā
Pat.	=	Patañjali
Prad.	=	*Pradīpa*
Sid-Kau.	=	*Siddhānta-Kaumudī*
Sw	=	Swaminathan
Vār.	=	*Vārttika*
कै.	=	कैयट
ना.	=	नागेश, नागोजिभट्ट
सि. कौ.	=	सिद्धान्तकौमुदी

Other abbreviations, which occur only occasionally, are self-explanatory, e. g. *TaittSaṁh.* (= *Taittirīya-Saṁhitā*).

ERRATA

Page	*Line*	*For*	*Read*
13	2	यासुद्-समुदायस्य	यासुद् समुदायस्य
13	3	सुपर्याप्तः,	सुपर्याप्तः ।
14	12	नाप्तासे	नाप्रासे
15	6	नेड् वशि कृति	नेड् वशि कृति
19	4	°रित्यादी°	°रित्यादि°
20	1	निर्म्लैयात्	निर्ग्लायात्
22	19	[अनं]त राविमौ	[अनं]तराविमौ।
23	9	(ह्युभयथा)	(? ह्युभयथा)
25	23	°व्यापृतो	°व्यावृत्तो
31	25	°नित्त्यवृर्थं	निवृत्त्यर्थं
33	9	तत्	तत
35	14	°प्रसिद्धिः	°प्रसिद्धिः ’
36	21	°शुक्लमा°	°क्लमा°
51	17	*roravitī*	*roravīti*
53	11	proceedes	proceeds
53	33	suffix)	suffix
89	22	upperfloors	upper floors
94	12	are intact	intact
138	14	नडादिभ्यः	नडादिभ्यः
147	14, 16	*adidhet*	*adīdhet*
188	30	गुरूमतो	गुरुमतो
235	17	*r* a,	*r*, a
238	7	the the	the
240	27	*r*	*r̄*